

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

3 1761 00371632 1

Cornell University

Ithaca, New York

CORNELL STUDIES
IN
CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

EDITED BY

CHARLES EDWIN BENNETT

AND

GEORGE PRENTICE BRISTOL

No. XIII

THE SUBJUNCTIVE SUBSTANTIVE CLAUSES IN PLAUTUS
NOT INCLUDING INDIRECT QUESTIONS

BY

CHARLES L. DURHAM



PUBLISHED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

BY
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1901

Cornell University

Ithaca, New York

CORNELL STUDIES

IN

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

EDITED BY

CHARLES EDWIN BENNETT

AND

GEORGE PRENTICE BRISTOL

No. XIII

THE SUBJUNCTIVE SUBSTANTIVE CLAUSES IN PLAUTUS
NOT INCLUDING INDIRECT QUESTIONS

BY

CHARLES L. DURHAM

PUBLISHED FOR THE UNIVERSITY

BY

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1901

THE
SUBJUNCTIVE SUBSTANTIVE CLAUSES
IN PLAUTUS

NOT INCLUDING INDIRECT QUESTIONS

BY

CHARLES L. DURHAM

CORNELL STUDIES IN CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY, NO. XIII

80340
~~18/9/56~~

COPYRIGHT, 1901,
BY CORNELL UNIVERSITY

—
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

PA
25
C7
V. 13

ITHACA, N. Y.
PRESS OF ANDRUS & CHURCH
1901

PREFACE.

The following study was undertaken at the suggestion of Professor Charles E. Bennett, and has throughout received his most generous attention. My thanks are also due Professor H. C. Elmer for his kind assistance while the work was going through the press.

CHARLES L. DURHAM.

*Ithaca, New York,
March 27, 1901.*

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION	1- 7
Original force of the Latin Subjunctive	1- 3
Parataxis	3- 5
<i>Ut</i> , etymology, original meaning, developed force	5- 7
CHAPTER I. SUBSTANTIVE CLAUSES DEVELOPED FROM THE JU-	
SIVE	8- 82
Justification of nomenclature, 8-10.—Derived Uses	10- 12
1. With verbs of Ordering, Commanding, <i>etc.</i>	13- 20
2. With the verbs VOLO, NOLO, MALO, in the senses, 'I want you to,' 'I want you not to,' 'I prefer you to'	20- 26
3. With verbs of Begging, Requesting, <i>etc.</i>	26- 35
4. With verbs of Advising, including (as extensions) verbs of Inducing and (as extensions of verbs of Inducing) also verbs of Compelling	35- 40
5. Constructions with FACIO ('See to it')	40- 50
6. With CURO and expressions of Striving	50- 52
7. With VIDEO, 'See to it'	52- 53
8. With OPERAM DO (ADDO), <i>etc.</i>	53- 54
9. Constructions with CAVE	54- 59
10. With verbs of Permitting, Granting, Allowing	60- 62
11. With verbs of Deciding, Resolving, <i>etc.</i>	63
12. Stipulative Substantive Clauses	64- 69
13. With POTIN, <i>etc.</i>	69- 70
14. With OPTIMUM EST, TEMPUS EST, DECEIT, AEQUUM EST, <i>etc.</i>	71- 73
15. OPUS EST, USUS EST, NECESSE EST, <i>etc.</i>	73- 74
16. With PROHIBEO, ABSTERREO, <i>etc.</i>	74- 75
17. With verbs of Deserving, <i>etc.</i>	75- 76
18. CAUSA EST UT	76
19. Expressions of Exempting and Refraining	77
20. Substantive Clauses of Proviso	77
21. With QUID EST QUOD ; NIHIL EST QUOD, <i>etc.</i>	77- 79
22. Substantive Clauses of Purpose	79- 80
23. Clauses introduced by QUAM.	80- 82

CHAPTER II. SUBSTANTIVE CLAUSES DEVELOPED FROM THE SUBJUNCTIVE OF DETERMINED RESOLUTION-----	83- 84
CHAPTER III. SUBSTANTIVE CLAUSES DEVELOPED FROM THE DELIBERATIVE SUBJUNCTIVE-----	85- 91
QUIN-Clauses-----	85- 90
CUR, QUAM OB REM-----	90
MIRUM QUIN-----	90- 91
CHAPTER IV. SUBSTANTIVE CLAUSES DEVELOPED FROM THE OPTATIVE SUBJUNCTIVE-----	92-108
1. With verbs of Wishing, Preferring, Choosing, Praying, and Hoping -----	92- 97
2. QUAM-Clauses after verbs of Wishing, Preferring, etc.-----	97- 98
3. After verbs of Fearing-----	98-106
4. Temporal Substantive Clauses of Optative origin introduced by DUM and UT-----	106-108
CHAPTER V. SUBSTANTIVE CLAUSES DEVELOPED FROM THE SUB- JUNCTIVE OF CONTINGENT FUTURITY -----	109
1. Substantive clauses of result-----	109-113
2. Substantive clauses introduced by QUASI with SIMULO, ADSI- MULO, DISSIMULO, CONSIMILE EST-----	113-115
3. QUOM-Clauses-----	115
ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA-----	116
INDEX OF MORE IMPORTANT PASSAGES DISCUSSED-----	117
INDEX OF SUBJECTS AND GOVERNING WORDS -----	118-120

INTRODUCTION.

THE ORIGINAL FORCE OF THE LATIN SUBJUNCTIVE.

That the inflectional forms which we call subjunctive are historically the result of a fusion of Indo-European subjunctive and optative formations is sufficiently obvious. Hence practically all investigators to-day are agreed in regarding the fundamental syntactical uses of the Latin subjunctive as an Indo-European inheritance, and as going back partly to the Indo-European subjunctive, partly to the Indo-European optative for their origin.

The question concerning the original value of the Indo-European subjunctive and optative is one which has given rise to much debate. Eliminating from discussion, as no longer entitled to serious consideration, the ancient view¹ that the subjunctive was primarily the mood of subordination, and the more recent one² that the subjunctive was the mood of an act conceived ("Modus der Vorstellung"), we find remaining two other views, which command our attention. One of these is represented by Delbrück,³ the other by Bergaigne.⁴ Delbrück attaches to each

¹This was the view of the Greek grammarians, as may be seen from the Greek name of the mood, *ὑποτακτική*. The Roman grammarians, with their customary habit of slavish imitation of the Greeks, adopted the same theory. In recent times this view has been revived by Krucziewicz, *Zeitschrift für öesterreichische Gymnasien*, 1894, p. 694 ff.

²Advocated by Kühner, Dräger, and others. The former of these two views flatly contradicts the practically demonstrated certainty that the subordinate clause is uniformly an outgrowth of the independent sentence. It involves, further, unsurmountable difficulties in accounting for the various uses of the subjunctive in principal sentences. The latter view attributes to the subjunctive a meaning too vague and shadowy to warrant acceptance.

³*Conjunktiv und Optativ im Sanskrit und Griechischen*, p. 11 ff.

⁴*De Conjunctivi et Optativi in Indo-Europeis linguis informatione et vi antiquissima*, pp. 41-50; 57-73.

of these two Indo-European moods two definite meanings, the second an outgrowth of the first; to him the subjunctive is the mood (1) of will, (2) of absolute futurity; the optative (1) of wish, (2) of contingent futurity. Bergaigne, on the other hand, contests the propriety of attributing to either of these Indo-European moods any such precise and narrow original value. His view is rather that the Indo-European subjunctive and optative alike originally covered the entire range of modal conception outside that of positive categorical assertion embraced by the indicative, and that the specific subjunctive and optative uses found in the various Indo-European languages are the result of selection in this wide field.¹

These last two views, fundamentally divergent as they are, involve vital principles of syntactical investigation, concerning which it is possibly premature to pronounce with confidence. Yet the general phenomena of linguistic growth seem to me to point so clearly to the original existence of a restricted value for every inflected form, that I am impelled for the present to accept as more probable the essence of Delbrück's view. The existence, too, in Old Indian, Iranian, Greek, and Latin of a number of substantially the same specific subjunctive and optative modal uses seems to me impossible to account for except upon the basis that the original value of each of these moods in Indo-European was a precise and definite one; cf. Delbrück, *Die Grundlagen der griechischen Syntax*, p. 116.

Taking then the original force of the subjunctive mood to be that of 'will' or 'determination',² showing itself in the first person as 'determined resolution'³ and in the second and third persons as 'jussive', and that of the optative mood to be first

¹ Bergaigne's view has, in essence, been revived recently by Morris (*Am. Jour. Phil.*, xviii, p. 392 f.), who aims to suggest the influences which tended to develop the various specific subjunctive uses appearing in Latin.

² Delbrück, *Conjunktiv und Optativ im Sanskrit und Griechischen*, p. 11 f.; *Vergl. Synt.*, 2, p. 374; Selimalz, *Syntax*³, p. 406 f.

³ Bennett, *Appendix*, § 354; Delbrück, *Vergl. Synt.*, 2, p. 384.

'wish', and secondly, 'contingent futurity' (the 'should'- 'would' idea), I shall endeavor to show that the subordinate subjunctives in the substantive clauses in the extant plays and fragments of Plautus can be referred for their origin and development to these original modal forces; that, while to the Latin mind a clear conception of this bifurcation, and feeling for it, in the origin of the mood—which was to it an integral one probably—was not present, still that it is possible for us with the wider knowledge of comparative grammar at hand, to go beyond this limited view and show which of these substantive clauses were in their origin Volitive (Determined Resolution, Jussive), and which were Optative (Wish, Contingent Futurity); furthermore, that *nē* (*nei*, *ni*, *neu*, *neve*) is the negative of the Volitive and the Optative, along with their developments, while *nōn* (*nec*, *neque*) is the negative of the Subjunctive of Contingent Futurity and its several developments, and that the occurrence of the one or the other negative calls for an effort on our part to explain the modal phenomenon as going back definitely either to the Volitive or Optative on the one hand, or to the Subjunctive of Contingent Futurity on the other; and finally to show that this development as indicated by the negative employed is always capable of demonstration except in those rare cases where subsequent development on Latin soil can be definitely shown.

Parataxis.

This term which has played so large a rôle in many treatises on the Latin subjunctive mood, is even yet, in spite of abundant discussion, not so definitely restricted in its application as the facts would seem to demand. Ordinarily scholars have applied it to that theoretical stage in the growth of language when all thought was expressed by independent sentences, which in a subsequent period grew into the subordination of hypotaxis.¹

It is in accordance with such a view of parataxis that we use the term as giving us the theory of the origin of most of our so-

¹ Cf. Lattmann, *de conjunctivo Latino*, p. 1 ff.

called complex sentences, *e. g.*, the theory that *metuo ne veniat* goes back to an original *ne veniat : metuo*.

Other writers apply the term parataxis to all sentences containing two parts which are not *formally* subordinated the one to the other. The term would embrace, according to their view, not only such sentences as *volo abeas, velim abeas*, where a one-time logically independent functioning of the parts is conceivable, but also such expressions as *nolo abeas*, which clearly could never have had such an origin; cf. Schmalz, *Syntax*³, § 209, who includes under this head such expressions as *certum est, cave, fac, ¹ facito, faxo, oportet, necesse est, operam do*, construed with the simple subjunctive (*i. e.*, without *ut*.) But to include under this head sentences of these types has been shown, I think, to be clearly wrong by Bennett, *Critique of Some Recent Subjunctive Theories* Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, Vol. IX, p. 71 f., who restricts parataxis as follows: "In order to exhibit parataxis, the two sentences assumed to have the paratactic relation must each be capable of possessing an independent value. Just so soon as one of the two clauses is not capable of functioning alone, but only in conjunction with its neighbor, we have subordination or hypotaxis. It is equally true that the presence or absence of any special subordinating sign is immaterial to the question of logical relationship." Cf. also Delbrück, in Brugmann's *Grundriss*, V, 3, p. 418 f. on "Unbezeichnete Hypotaxis," who also insists that the absence of any external sign of subordination does not constitute a ground for the assumption of an original parataxis; Ziemer, *Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie*, 1899, No. 39, column 1063. This last view of parataxis appears to be the only safe one.

Under such a conception, of parataxis, we may, therefore, class if we wish such various parenthetical expressions as *opsecro, obtestor, amabo, oro, age, agite, etc.*, but certainly not sentences in which one part is logically subordinated to the other, even though lacking the conventional subordinating particle.

¹Cf. Delbrück in Brugmann, *Grundriss*, V, 3, p. 420.

It is not meant that even in the clearest case of parataxis there would be no logical relation between the parts. That stage of language where successive ideas were not even psychologically correlated and where the superior importance of one statement with reference to one immediately consecutive failed to exist, must indeed have been primeval. Lattmann, p. 2, rightly says: "Nam parataxis est nulla quae non hypotacticam aliquo modo sententiam contineat." Cf. also the remark of Riemann¹ § 278, n. 1: "Il faut en effet distinguer la juxtaposition employée au lieu de la coordination (asyndète), (*i. e.*, l'emploi de plusieurs termes ou propositions, qui sont coordonnés logiquement mais entre lesquels on omet la conjonction de liaison, *et*, *ou*, *mais*, *car*, *etc.*, que le sens demanderait) et la juxtaposition employée au lieu de la subordination (parataxe)."

I have not discussed at length the valuable monographs on the subject of parataxis by Weissenhorn,² Weninger,³ Becker,⁴ Lindskog,⁵ and Antoine.⁶ In thus dismissing them with a word, I have no intention of depreciating them as unimportant contributions, for they are indispensable papers, but individual discussion does not seem to be demanded after the general remarks just made; Weissenhorn, *e. g.*, on his very first page assumes that the absence of a sign of coördination although there is logical subordination, justifies the treatment of the clauses as paratactic.

Ut.

The large rôle played by *ut* in subjunctive substantive clauses requires a passing word concerning its original signification. The

¹ *Syntaxe Latine*,³ Paris, 1894.

² *Parataxis Plautina*, Burghausen, 1884.

³ *De parataxis in Terenti fabulis vestigiis*, Erlangen, 1888.

⁴ *Beiordnende u. unterordnende Satzverbindung bei den altrömischen Bühnendichlern*. Metz, 1888.

⁵ *Quaestiones de parataxi et hypotaxi apud priscos Latinos*. Lundae, 1896.

⁶ *De la parataxe et de l'hypotaxe dans la langue latine*, in *Annales de la Faculté des Lettres de Bordeaux et des Universités du Midi*, 1899.

exact etymology of the word has for years been a matter of discussion, and even now is not definitely settled. The question has hinged for the most part on its connection with some form of the root *quo-*. The subject has been widely discussed, among others by Weber in his review of Corssen's *Krit. Beitr. z. latein. Formenlehre* (*Z. f. d. Gymn.* XIX, 1865, p. 32 f.); I. Kozlovski (*K. Z.* 32, 563 f.); Bersu, *Die Gutturalen*, p. 138 f.; Dahl, *Die lateinische Partikel ut*, p. 2 f.; Zubaty, *Zur Etymologie einig. latein. Wörter*, p. 1 f.; and more latterly by Johannes Schmidt, *K. Z.*, 32, 404 f.; Bugge, *Altital. Stud.*, p. 75 f.

The exact etymology of the word is, however, fortunately of minor importance, for its logical equivalence is fairly clear. *Qui*, the adverb, has relative, interrogative, and indefinite functions. The relative and interrogative forces of *ut* are placed beyond dispute by a multitude of examples. The interrogative force is in classical Latin, to be sure, confined mainly to indirect questions, but in Plautus it is common as a direct interrogative and it occurs here and there in classical times; cf. e.g. Hor. *Sat.* ii, 8, 1, and Kiessling, *ad loc.* Why should *ut* not complete the analogy and have an indefinite value corresponding to that of *qui*, 'in some way', 'somehow', 'just'¹? That *ut* did have this force seems clear from the fact that it is freely used interchangeably with *qui* in independent optative and jussive uses in early Latin; cf. e.g. Terence, *Phorm.* 123, *qui illum di omnes perduint*, with *Eun.* 302, *Ut illum di deaeque perdant*. For further illustrations of this use of *ut*, see Plaut. *Capt.* 115, *sed uti adserventur magna diligentia*: 'Ter. *Ad.*, 280, *At ut omne reddat*. In many of these sentences it is usual to explain the *ut*-clause as subordinate and dependent upon some verb to be supplied, such as *fac*, *cura*, or the like. But this seems extremely unnatural, and in many instances creates serious difficulty, e.g., in the case of the optatives above cited. Moreover it involves taking *ut* in such sentences differently from *qui*, whereas the equivalence of usage of the two particles is manifest. In further support of the value

¹ See Bennett, *Appendix*, § 368.

of *ut* (*qui*) above maintained, *cf.* the use of *modo*, originally ‘in a way’, ‘in some way’, ‘only’; precisely the same development is maintained for *ut* and *qui* as for *modo*; all are indefinite instrumentals of manner.

The view that *ut* in sentences of the type just cited is an interrogative particle, seems to me extremely artificial and unsupported by any evidence.

But whatever meaning we may advocate as original for *ut*, its presence or absence as a special sign of subordination in a substantive clause is immaterial to the question of coördination or subordination between the parts.¹ In both *oro abeas* and *oro ut abeas*, the *abeas* is, I maintain, clearly subordinate. The form with *ut* was very likely subsequent to that where *ut* was not used,² and probably arose after *abeas* came to be felt as a dependent clause, with which an introductory particle was appropriate. The necessary presence of *ne* in the negative form of the clause probably assisted in establishing the clause with *ut*.³ The original difference between *volo abeas* and *volo ut abeas* must have been approximately that between “I want you to go away” and “I want you just to go away.”

¹ Cf. above p. 4 f.; Riemann-Goelzer, *Gram. Comp.* § 352, 2, d, Le Subjonctif seul s’emploi dans le même sens qu’une proposition avec *ut* avec les verbes ou les expressions signifiant une manifestation de la volonté ou nécessité obligation.

² Cf. in general on the chronology of the conjunctions from relative stems, Jacobi, *Compositum und Nebensatz*, chapter ix, Das Absolutivum, p. 95 f.

³ Cf. Bennett, *Appendix*, § 382.

CHAPTER I.

SUBSTANTIVE CLAUSES DEVELOPED FROM THE JUSSIVE.

Our first category in the treatment of the Subjunctive Substantive Clauses consists of those derived from the Indo-European Subjunctive of 'Will' represented by that usage of the Latin Subjunctive which has received the name 'Jussive'.

In view of the fact that sentences of this type have been treated by different scholars in such various ways, it would seem necessary to justify, at the outset, our present basis of classification and its nomenclature.

Many of the differences of opinion between leading scholars are doubtless to a greater or less extent due to failure in exact agreement as to the precise definitions of some of the *termini technici* of Latin syntax, but it is clearly the duty of an investigator always to insist on accuracy of usage in technical terms and not to make shift with those that are hazy or incorrectly applied. With reference, now, to such appellations as "Substantive Clauses of Purpose", "Complementary Final Clauses", etc., which are sometimes applied to sentences of the type under consideration, the error is not in mistaking the original force of the given occurrence of the hypotactic subjunctive, but in the historical treatment of the use of the mood. It is, of course, a generally admitted fact that the Clause of Purpose had its origin in the Jussive Subjunctive, but it does not follow that all substantive clauses derived originally from the Jussive have had their origin in this derived Purpose Clause. The strongest argument against calling substantive clauses of the kind under discussion "Substantive Clauses of Purpose" is simply this: they are *not* substantive clauses of purpose or any other kind of clause of purpose; ordinarily they contain no idea of purpose, nor did they conceivably ever do so. To say, for instance, that such a sentence

as Pers. 605: *Jubendum ea hoc accedat ad me* contains a "Substantive Clause of Purpose" is to classify on the basis of a mental condition which, it is true, may be connoted by the verb of ordering,¹ but which is no more entitled to be made the basis of classification than is any one of the numerous other mental concomitants of a state of mind in which a speaker issues an order. It is similarly impossible to detect any original purpose notion in various other types of clause that are commonly classified as substantive clauses of purpose or complementary final clauses; *e. g.*, there is no conceivable purpose notion in such expressions as *licet abeas*; *oportet secum reputet*; *sino dicat*; *fac cures*; *senatus decernit consules videant*; *confiteare necesse est*, etc., etc.

Not only does the obvious signification of these clauses weigh against the theory of a purpose origin, but we have other proofs also that their origin should be sought immediately in the Jussive. Thus the theory of a Jussive origin is supported by the frequent occurrence of such collocations as an imperative used as an alternative of the substantive jussive clause, *e. g.* Pl. *Pers.* 1050: *fac curam des atque nuntiato*; and also by the usage of imperatives in virtual dependence on precisely the same verbs that take the subjunctive clause, *e. g.*, Pl. *Most.* 848: *i licet = eas licet*; Ter. *Eun.* 912: *move te, oro*; Luer. *de rer. nat.*, iii, 962: *concede, necesse est*.

A further argument of great weight is to be found in the frequent absence of *ut* in these clauses. This constitutes a fatal objection to the recognition of a purpose origin, since in pure purpose clauses *ut* is never absent.

Such a thing as a genuine substantive clause of purpose undoubtedly does exist in the Latin language, *e. g.*, in *hostes eo consilio venerunt ut flumen transirent*, and the like; but expressions of this type are limited to appositional phrases following *eo consilio*, *hac causa*, and similar phrases, where, except for the ablative, the subordinate clauses would be adverbial and not substantive.

I maintain, therefore that, "Substantive Clause developed

I. e., the person who gives the order may have the purpose in mind of having the person approach him.

from the Jussive" as opposed to "Substantive Clause of Purpose" is the more accurate term in all of those sentences where the subordinate clause has its origin immediately in an original Jussive Subjunctive, and not meditately through the derived Clause of Purpose.

I proceed now to a systematic classification of the material coming under the head of substantive clauses derived from original jussive subjunctives. The different verbs are arranged in categories on the basis of their meaning. Under each category I have put first all instances of the simple subjunctive without *ut* (where such occur); next all instances of the subjunctive with *ut*; thirdly, instances of the subjunctive with *ne*; lastly, instances with *ut ne*. In treating each of these four classes, the examples where the Subjunctive precedes (as pointing probably to the earlier type of construction) are given first. Under each of the four classes I have treated first those clauses which represent original uses, *i. e.*, clauses in which the subjunctive may be conceived as having been at one time an independent jussive in paratactic use, *e. g.*, *te jubeo, abeas*. Secondly, I put those subjunctives which represent derived uses, *i. e.*, subjunctives where the assumption of an original independent jussive is impossible, *e. g.*, *jubet abeamus*. Here *abeamus* cannot originally have stood in any paratactic combination, since an *abeatis* (or *abite*) would represent the original order issued by the subject of *jubet*; *abeamus*, therefore, in this sentence clearly represents a derived use modelled on those expressions in which the subjunctive was originally truly jussive.

These derived uses are so various in character, and their understanding bears so vitally upon the method and results of the present investigation that it seems advisable at the outset to discuss more fully what is brought under the head of "Derived Uses" in the discussion and classification which constitute the body of this investigation.

Taking as an original type the sentence *te jubeo mihi filiam*

despondeas, I conceive this to have led to the following varieties of "extensions":

a) "Extensions within the Present."

These may be of several varieties. Thus on the analogy of the original type we find such expressions as *me jubet sibi filiam despondeam*, which clearly cannot have been an original form of expression dating from the days of parataxis, for a *sibi filiam despondeam* as an independent expression is hardly conceivable. Or again one may say *te jubet sibi filiam despondeas*, which is likewise manifestly an extension by analogy as opposed to an original use. Or we may have *eum jubet sibi filiam despondeat*; or *eum jubes tibi filiam despondeat*; or *me jubes tibi filiam despondeam*. Of the six sentences given, one only, therefore, can be original. The others are natural extensions which follow the analogy of the "original use." Extensions of this sort I have called "Extensions within the Present." Sometimes the extension is not in the dependent clause but is in the governing verb, as, for example, when I say *tibi edicam ne abeas*, after the analogy of *tibi edico ne abeas*. Expressions of this kind I have classed under the same head of "Extensions within the Present."

b) "Extensions in Tense." The commonest illustration of such extensions of tense is found in the case of imperfects representing a present projected into the past, e. g., *Stichus*, 624: *dixi equidem in carcerem ires*, where *ires* obviously cannot have been original, but simply represents an original *eas* projected into past time. This projection into the past is also often accompanied by an extension of person as well as of tense, e. g., *Aul.*, 281 *edixit mihi ut dispertirem* (originally *dispertias*).

Other tenses also figure (though less frequently) in these "Extensions of Tense." Thus we should hardly find a perfect subjunctive in independent optative use employed as a present perfect. Yet substantive clauses of optative origin do show this force, e. g., *Poenulus*, 950: *Deos veneror ut rite venerim* "that I have come"; similarly with verbs of fearing, *Truc.* 774: *timeo ne malefacta mea sint inventa omnia*, 'have been discovered'. Even the pluperfect at times occurs, e. g., *Pseud.* 912: *metuebam male ne abisses*.

c) "Negative Extensions." It is clearly manifest that an expression, *tibi non edico ut abeas* cannot represent an original type of speech. To say 'go away, I don't tell you to' is a contradiction in terms.

d) "Interrogative Extensions." Similarly a *quis tibi mandat ut emas*, cannot conceivably represent an original parataxis, for the contradiction is again patent.

e) A very important category is that of "Extensions by analogy of the meaning of the verb." I refer to such constructions as the substantive clause after *exoro*, *perpello*, *persuadeo*, *impetro*, etc., (See below Categories 3, 4). Here the negative (*ne*) points clearly to the jussive origin of the clause, yet an original *te exoro ut mihi ignoscatur*; *tibi persuadeo ut abcas*, etc., cannot be accepted. No sane person would ever have been likely to say 'go away ! I persuade you (to)' ; 'pardon me ! I secure my request (that you do).' It remains only to explain the construction with these verbs as of secondary origin and modelled on the construction with the simple verbs with which they are compounded. A recognition of this influence in syntactical development is, I believe, of the highest importance. Fuller details of its operation are given at a later point.

f) "Passive Extensions." I have also deemed it fit to recognize these, though they play a much smaller rôle than any of those previously enumerated. An example is *Most.* 876, *ut eant vocitantur*, evidently modelled on some such active form as *vos voco* (in the sense of *ordering*) *ut catis*.

Other varieties of "extensions" also occur, but they are confined mostly to varieties in the modal form of the governing verb, and have not received special recognition in this investigation. Combinations also of one or more of the extensions above enumerated are frequent. In such cases, I have classified on the basis of what seemed to me the most salient element in the extension. At times this procedure may appear somewhat arbitrary, but in singling out one feature of the extension for the purposes of classification, I have not meant to ignore other features, even though I may have omitted to call attention to them.

I. WITH VERBS OF ORDERING, COMMANDING, etc.

A. Subjunctive alone.

ORIGINAL USES.

1. Subjunctive precedes.

No instances occur.

2. Subjunctive follows.

a) *dico*.

Poen. 1155: *dico, Tuam mihi majorem filiam despondeas.*

b) *interdico*.

Capt. 694: *nihil interdico aiant vivere.* The MSS. evidence for *aiant* is not beyond question, *dicant* being also read; but this is immaterial to our investigation, since each is a subjunctive.

DERIVED USES.

Extensions within the Present (see p. 11).

a) *jubeo*.

St. 396: *jube famulos rem divinam mi apparent.* (Direct form: *apparetis*).

Men. 955: *tu servos jube Hunc ad me ferant.* (Direct form: *ad eum feratis*).

Rud. 708: *jube modo accedat prope.*

Pers. 605: *Jubendum ea hoc accedat ad me.*

Most. 930: *Curriculo jube in urbem veniat.*

b) *instituo*.

Amph. 959: *Atque ita servom par videtur frugi instituere Proinde eri ut sint, ipse item sit: voltum e voltu comparet: Tristis sit hilarus sit.*

Extensions in Tense. (See p. 11.)

Imperfect.

a) *praedico.*

Merc. 51: *Conclamitare tota urbe et praedicere Omnes timerent.*

The imperfect *timerent* manifestly cannot be the original form of the command as issued, since all orders must look to the future, either immediate or remote; hence, we must consider here that we are dealing merely with a projection into the past of *timeatis*.

b) *dico.*

St. 624: *Dixi equidem in carcerem ires.*

This can be only a projection into the past of *eas in carcerem*.

B. Subjunctive with *ut*. (Verbs of *Ordering*, *Commanding*, etc.)

ORIGINAL USES.

1. Subjunctive precedes:

No instances.

2. Subjunctive follows:

a) *dico.*

Men. 990: *dico ut imperium meum Sapienter habeatis curae.*

Ps. 511: *Jam dico ut a me caveas.*

Pers. 281: *Dico ut perpetuo pereas.*

Capt. 844: *Ita dico magnus ut sit.*

Ps. 517^b: *Dico inquam ut caveas: cave.*

b) *mando.*

Merc. 835: *mando rem bene ut tutemini.*

c) *edico.*

Ps. 855: *edico tibi Ut nostra properes amoliri . . . ut hiujus oculos in oculis habeas tuis.*

d) *jubeo.*

Poen. 4: *Audire jubet vos imperator histricus, Bonoque ut animo sedeant in subselliis.*

e) *praemonstro.*

Trin. 342: *praemonstro tibi Ut ita te aliorum miserescat.*

f) *praecipio*.

Ps. 161: Tibi hoc praecipio ut niteant aedes.

g) *praedico*.

Ps. 517^a: Praedico ut caveas.

h) *multa* (*suggesting the order of the court*).

As. 801: Haec multa ei esto, vino Ut careat.

DERIVED USES.

Extensions within the Present. (See p. 11.)

a) *dico*.

Trin. 583: dic Callicli me ut conveniat. (Direct form: *eum convenias*).

Miles, 185^a: hoc ei dicio: (Profecto ut ne degrediatur) Earumque artem et disciplinam (ut) optineat colere.

Mil. 1089: Philocomasio dic domum ut transeat. (Direct form: *domum transeas*).

Mil. 1191: illi dicam, ut me adjutorem roget.

Men. 1044: dicam ut a me abeat.

Truc. 849: Dicam ut aliam condicionem filio inveniat suo.

Capt. 920: Dicam ut sibi penum alibi adornet.

Rud. 1096: Haud iniquom dicit, Gripe, ut ostendatur vidulus.

Cas. 680: id huc missa suu tibi ut dicerem Ab ea ut caveas tibi.

b) *mando, flagito*.

Bacch. 526: mandas mihi: Mnesilochium ut requiram atque ut eum adducam.

Merc. 178: flagitas me ut eloquar.

c) *edico*.

Ps. 127: amicis notisque edico meis a me ut caveant.

d) *jubeo*.

Amph. 205: Telebois jubet sententiam ut dicant suam.

e) *impero*.

Men. 855: Ita mihi imperas ut hujus membra Commixuam.

Men. 841: imperat ut ego illic oculos exuram.

Miles, 1161: Voluptatem mecastor mihi imperas

Nempe ut adsimulem.

f) provocō.

Circ. 355: *Provocat me in aleam ut ego ludam.*

g) praecipio.

Miles, 256: *dice, monstra, praecipe, Ut teneat consilia.*

Miles, 795-6: *ita praecipito mulieri ut simulet se tuam esse uxorem.*

h) doceo, edoceo, perdoceo.

Miles, 355: *edocebo minime malas ut sint malae.*

Ep. 364: *docebo ut sibi esse datum argentum dicat.*

Poen. 195: *Hanc perdoceamus ut ferat fallaciam.*

i) nuntio.

Poen. 1118: *nuntiate ut prodeat.*

j) monstrō.

Men. 788: *quotiens monstravi tibi viro ut morem geras?*

k) clamito.

Ps. 1276: *clamitant me ut revortar.*

l) verbis arcesso.

Miles, 1185: *in atris verbis Philocomasium arcessito, Ut eat tecum Atque ut jubeat.*

m) depending on context.

Bacch. 749: *quid istis ad istunc usus conscriptis modum (Ut tibi nequid credat atque) ut te adservet?*

Pers. 165: *ego puerum volo Mittere ad amicam meam: ut habeat animum bonum.*

Rud. 1294: *litteris Signabo ut veniat.*

n) multa (suggesting the order of the court.)

Capt. 493: *irrogabo multam ut mihi cenas deceam dent.*

Extensions in Tense (see p. 11).

Imperfect.

a) edico.

Men. 784: *edixi tibi ut caveres. (Originally *caveas*).*

Aul. 281: *edixit mihi ut dispertere. (Originally *dispertias*).*

Ps. 897: *opere edixit maximo ut mihi caverem.*

b) *dico*.

Ps. 1227: dixii ab eo ut caveres?

Pers. 304: dixi ut nuntiares.

c) *jubeo*.

Ps. 1150: eris me jussit ut tecum mitteres.

d) *mando*.

Curc. 346: ei mandavi ut daret operam.

Amph. Prol. 81: in mandatis dedit, ut conquistores fierent histrioibus: Qui sibi mandasset delegati ut plauderent Ejus ornamenti et corium ut conciderent.

Stichus, 652: mandaveram ut nuntiaret atque diceret.

Epid. 47: mandavit mihi . . ut fidicina . . emeretur sibi.

Merc. 426: mandavit mihi ut emerem.

Merc. 427: Mandavit ut ad illam faciem emerem.

e) *respondeo*.

Amph. 214: Respondent bello se et suos tutari posse, proinde uti exercitus deducerent.

f) *impero*.

Ps. 697: ita imperavit ut aliquem adducerem.

g) *doceo, perdoceo*.

Ps. 1194: Docuit ut abduceres.

Trin. 632: Quid faceres, si quis docuisset te ut odio esses?

Capt. 719: perdocere ut consulerem tibi.

h) *tabulas fero*.

Bacch. 811: tabulas tetuli ut vincirer.

i) *on context*.

Merc. 60: ne liberet vivere.

Extensions to the Passive. (See p. 12.)

Most. 876: Ubi advorsum ut eant vocitantur.

Pers. 241: edictumst omnes ut eloquerentur.

Miles, 956: hoc ut agerem mandatumst mihi.

Curc. 411: mandatumst mihi ut ferrem.

Poen. 280: haec didici omnia. MI. Etiamne ut ames eam?

disco here serves, as often, as the passive of *doceo*, and follows the same construction.

C. Subjunctive with *ne*. (Verbs of *Ordering, Commanding, etc.*)

ORIGINAL USES.

1. Subjunctive precedes.

dico.

Merc. 465: Ad portum ne bitas deico jam tibi.

2. Subjunctive follows.

a) *dico.*

Trin. 520: Per deos . . . dico ne tu illunc agrum Tuom siris umquam fieri.

b) *edico.*

Truc. 780: edico prius: Ne duplices habeatis linguis.

c) *praedico.*

Aul. 99: praedico tibi . . . ne intromiseris.

d) *auris obtundo.*

Cis. 118: auris obtundo tuas Nequeam ames.

e) After the analogy of *edico*, we find an instance of a substantive clause after the noun *edicta*.

Poen. 16 f: edicta ut servetis mea Scortum exoletum nequis in proscaenio Sedeat, neu lictor verbum aut virgae muttiant, Neu dissignator praeter os obambulet Neu sessum ducat.

f) *eminor, interminor.*

Capt. 791: Eminor interminorque nequis mihi obstiterit obviam.

DERIVED USES.

Extensions within the Present.

a) *dico.*

Epid. 164: dicam, . . . Ne hinc foras exambulet neve . . . veniat.

Pers. 390: dicam . . . Ne te indotatum dicas.

b) *edico.*

Ps. 506: Ne quisquam credat nūminum jam edicam.

Ps. 903 : edicam familiaribus Profecto ne quis quicquam credat Pseudolo.

c) *interdico.*

Miles, 1057 : interdixi meam ne sic volgo pollicitere operam.

Pers. 621 : interdixit nequid mirer.

d) *nuto.*

Men. 612 : nutat ne loquar.

e) *monstro.*

Men. 788 : monstravi tibi ne id observes.

Extensions in Tense.

Imperfect.

As. 938 : Dicebam, pater, tibi ne matri consuleres male.

Cure. 549 : mandasti nuntium ne spernerem.

Miles, 123 : mihi signum dedit ne se appellarem.

Capt. 752 : illis documentum dabo Ne tale quisquam facinus incipere audeat.

Passive Extensions.

Pers. 241 : Edictumst ne crederem.

Miles, 247 : id praecipiundumst ne titubet.

D. Subjunctive with *ut ne*. '(Verbs of *Ordering, Commanding, etc.*)

ORIGINAL USES.

None occur.

DERIVED USES.

Extensions within the Present.

Poen. 887 : indicasso ei quoque ut ne enuntiet.

Miles, 185^a : hoc ei dicito: ut ne quoquam de ingenio degrediatur.

Bacch. 749 : quid istis ad istunc usus conscriptis modum, Ut tibi nequid credat?

Clauses with *ut ne* in these and similar instances differ from those with simple *ne* precisely as the substantive clause with *ut* differs

from those clauses in which *ut* is absent. That is to say, *ut* was at the outset the intensive particle with the value of 'just' or 'only'; see above p. 7.

2. WITH THE VERBS VOLO, NOLO, MALO, IN THE SENSES 'I WANT YOU TO,' 'I WANT YOU NOT TO,' 'I PREFER YOU TO'.

In most of the examples cited under this category there will probably be little doubt that the usage is to be referred definitely to a jussive origin. In some instances, perhaps, others will see in the main verb the idea of 'wish' where I have recognized the stronger notion of an authoritative expression of 'will', and will refer these clauses to an optative origin. Yet such differences of interpretation in individual passages are of slight importance.

The material is as follows :

A. Volo with Subjunctive alone.

ORIGINAL USES.

1. The Subjunctive precedes.

Miles, 546 : Erum exhibeas volo.

Poen. 1197 : At enim hoc agas volo.

Poen. 1151 : Patruo advenienti cena curetur volo.

Capt. 383 : Ergo animum advortas volo.

Capt. 388 : nunc animum advortas volo.

Capt. 430 : animum advortas volo.

Amph. Prol. 56 : Utrum sit an non voltis ?

2. Subjunctive follows.

Cis. 82 : Hoc volo agatis.

Miles, 876 : denuo volo percipiatis plane.

Rud. 414 : juris jurando volo Gratiam facias.

Poen. 593 : Eum mihi volo demonstretis hominem. This is answered by "*Nos curabimus, satis praeceptumst.*"

Ps. 1147 : BA. quid vis tibi? HA. (Volo) Argentum accipias.

DERIVED USES.

Extensions within the Present.

Bacch. 707 : At, placide volo Unumquidque agamus.

Stich. 670 : Volo eluamus hodie.

B. Subjunctive with *ut*. (With *volo*.)

ORIGINAL USES.

Bacch. 989^a : Volo ut quod jubebo facias.

Rud. 1216 : (volo) Quod promisisti ut memineris.

Rud. 960-1 : dimidium Volo ut dicas.

Poen. 1398 : (volo) Ut minam mihi argenti reddas.

Ps. 921 : volo Tu prior ut occupes adire.

Merc. 560 : Ut mihi aedis aliquas conducat volo.

Merc. 622 : (volo) Ut pereas.

Ps. 660 : (volo) Iude ut me acceras.

Aul. 351 : (volo) Hos ut accipias coquos.

Ps. 321 : (volo) Ut opperiare.

DERIVED USES.

Extensions within the Present.

Aul. 743 : deos credo voluisse, ut te enicem.

Cis. 13 : vos arbitror velle, ea ut expetessam.

Cas. 828 : volunt haec ut infecta faciant.

Ps. 1247 : voltis ut me . . . aliquis tollat?

Mil. 1275 : (volt) ad se ut eas.

Extensions in Tense.

Imperfect.

As. Prol. 6 : (volui) ut sciretis nomen hujus fabulae.

Numquid vis.

Next come the instances with this common formula used when one person is departing from another. Of course the vocal intonation of the answer would be the best means of deciding the nature of the dependent subjunctive,—whether jussive or optative. We can be guided only by the context, the occasional presence of imperatives in the reply, and, to some extent, by the relative social status of the persons engaged in the conversation.

A. With the Simple Subjunctive.

ORIGINAL USES.

Trin. 192: ME. Numquid vis? CA. Cures tuam fidem.

Bacch. 604: PA. Numquid vis? PI. Abeas.

Cure. 525: LY. Numquid vis, leno? CA. Istas minas
des.

Capt. 191: ERG. Numquid vis? HE. Venias temperi.

Poen. 801: CO. Numquid me? AG. Apscedas: Sumas orna-
tum tuom. The formula is slightly different here.

B. With ut and the Subjunctive.

ORIGINAL USES.

Amph. 544: IV. numquid vis? AL. Etiam: ut actutum ad-
venias.

Amph. 542: IV. Numquid vis? AL. Ut quom absim me
ames.

Ps. 665: HA. Numquid vis? PS. Dormitum ut abeas.

Miles, 259: PE. Numquid aliud? PA. Intro ut abeas.

In this and in the following, the formula is slightly changed.

Capt. 448: Numquid aliud? TYN. Ut redeas.

Miles, 1195: PI. Numquid aliud? PA. Haec ut memineris.

Truc. 432: DI. Num quippam aliud me vis? PHIL. Ut
. ad me revisas, valeas.

C. With ne and the Subjunctive.

ORIGINAL USES.

Miles. 575: SC. Numquid nunc aliud me vis? PE. Ne me
noveris.

Bacch. 757: PI. Numquid aliud? CH. Hoc Ne
quoquam exsurgatis.

Quid vis.

With the Simple Subjunctive.

ORIGINAL USES.

None occur.

DERIVED USES.

Extensions within the Present.

St. 115 : Quid vis tibi dicam, pater ? This is in answer to *Dic vicissim nunciam tu.*

Bacch. 692 : Quid vis curem ? This is followed in the next line by four imperatives in answer.

Merc. 158 : Quid vis faciam ?

Aul. 634 : EVC. Redde huc sis. STR. Quid tibi vis reddam ?

Miles, 300 : Quid tibi vis dicam ?

Most. 578 : Quid tibi ego morem vis geram ? This is in reply to *Ah, gere morem mihi*, and is answered by *abi quaeso hinc domum.*

Epid. 19^a : Quid tibi vis dicam ?

Epid. 584 : quid loquar vis ?

Some may prefer to recognize here independent deliberatives, comparing the Greek *τί βούλει ποιῶ*; but to me it seems better to regard the subjunctive as an object clause by a simple and natural extension.

Vin.

With the Simple Subjunctive.

ORIGINAL USES.

None occur.

DERIVED USES.

Extensions within the Present.

Capt. 360 : HE. vin vocem huc ad te ? TYN. Voca.

Cas. 272 : vin tuis Chalinum huc evocem verbis foras ?

Ps. 324 : vein etiam te faciam ex laeto laetantem magis ?

St. 397 : vin administrem ?

St. 486 : Vin ad te ad cenam veniam ?

Capt. 858 : Vin te faciam fortunatum ?

Poen. 439 : vin bona dicam fide ?

Miles, 335 : Vin jam faciam ?

Pers. 575 : Vin huc vocem ?

Trin. 59 : Vin commitemus ? tuam ego ducam et tu meam ?

Merc. 721 : Vin dicam ?

Poen. 1226 : vin hanc ego adprendam ?

Poen. 990 : Vin appellem hunc Punice ?

Truc. 502 : Vin adeam ad hominem ?

Truc. 924 : Vin te amplectar, suavium dem ?

As. 647 : Vin faciam ut te amplexetur ?

St. 736 : Vin amicam hic evocemus ?

Ps. 522 : Vin etiam dicam ?

Men. 606 ; Vin hunc rogem ?

Cas. 544 : Vin vocem ?

Vis ? Visne ?

With Simple Subjunctive.

ORIGINAL USES.

None occur.

DERIVED USES.

Extensions Within the Present.

Merc. 486 : Visne eam ad portum Atque eximam mulierem ?

Trin. 1091 : Visne aquam Tibi petam ?

Merc. 728 : etiam vis nomen dicam ?

Capt. 121 : mene vis dem ipse in pedes ?

Most. 322 : Visne ego te ac tu me amplectare ? *Amplectar* is, of course, implied after *ego*.

Malo, malim.

A. Subjunctive alone.

ORIGINAL USES.

1. Subjunctive precedes.

Poen. 1150 : Facias modo mavelimi.

Ps. 209 : At taceas malo.

B. Subjunctive with Ut.

Trin. 762 : Malim hercle ut verum dicas.

Sentences of the type : nolo ames.

Sentences of this type are clearly secondary analogical developments¹. They are particularly valuable since they show conclusively the developed hypotactic stage, and the utter absence of parataxis, for in no way can we conceive of *nolo* and *ames* as functioning alone, that is, as sustaining a paratactic relation to each other, since it is impossible to suppose that *nolo ames* ever meant, 'love! I don't want you to'. The *nolo* is clearly used simply by analogy with *volo* in such sentences as *volo ames*. This latter was without doubt developed from *ames* : *volo* in parataxis, but the analogical extension of *volo ames* to *nolo ames*, could hardly have occurred until all feeling for the original parataxis had disappeared, and until the *ames* was felt to be subordinated to *volo* and to depend upon it as object. The sentence of this type offers one of the most convincing proofs that parataxis in subjunctive clauses of the type embraced by this study did not exist in the historical period of Latin.

A close parallel to *nolo ames* is found in the *vetabo sit* of Horace C. iii, 2.26. This, as is evident, can be explained only upon the analogy of something like *jubebo sit*.

The material in Plautus is as follows :

Pers. 245 : Nolo ames.

Merc. 107 : Eam me advexisse nolo resciscat pater.

Ps. 436 : Vetus nolo faciat.

Cas. 233 : Nolo ames.

Most. 1176 : TH. Nolo ores. CA. Quaeso hercle. TH. Nolo inquam ores.

St. 734 : nolo obtaedescat.

Truc. 585 : Vasa nolo auferant.

Trin. 945 : Deinde porro nolo quicquam praedices.

In each of the eight above instances it will be noticed that the *nolo* precedes the subordinated subjunctive substantive clause, *i. e.*, in this type of hypotaxis the subjunctive always follows. Does this indicate that in the undeveloped paratactic stage, the

¹ Cf. Bennett, *Critique*, p. 71 f.

independent jussive subjunctive regularly preceded the verb on which it afterwards was to depend, and that their relative position tended to shift after the hypotactic stage was thoroughly developed? At all events, too great emphasis cannot be laid upon the fact of the fundamental error of those who maintain that because there is no external mark of subordination (whatever the relative position of the parts under discussion may be) we are to recognize the presence of parataxis rather than hypotaxis.

3. VERBS OF BEGGING, REQUESTING, Etc.

A. Subjunctive alone.

ORIGINAL USES.

1. Subjunctive precedes.

Merc. 992^a: *Modo pacem faciatis oro.*

In this sentence the *oro* may of course be treated as parenthetic, and, paratactic, therefore, in one sense. But granting that this parenthetic interpretation is possible in many instances, still sentences like the one before us should be considered in this discussion.

2. The Subjunctive follows.

a) *quaeso.*

Miles, 1341: *Bene quaeso inter vos dicatis.*

Capt. 340: *Verum, te quaeso, hunc mihi des.*

Men. 1073: *quaeso ignoscas.*

b) *obsecro.*

Aul. 715: *obsecro vos ego, mi auxilio sitis et hominem demonstretis.*

Most. 1156: *te obsecro, Stultitiae adulescentiaeque ejus ignorcas.*

Miles, 540: *te opsecro . . . Inscitiae Meae et stultitiae ignoscas.*

c) *amabo.*

Rud. 430: *amabo vel tu mi aias vel neges.*

DERIVED USES.

Extensions Within the Present.

a) *oro.*

Amph. 257: *orant, ignoscamus peccatum suom.*

b) *rogo*.

Most. 680: Roga circumducat.

Extensions in Tense.

Imperfect.

Pers. 634: rogarat diceret.

B. Subjunctive with *ut* (Verbs of Begging, Requesting, etc.)

ORIGINAL USES.

1. Subjunctive precedes.

quaeso.

Poen. 1412: Id uti ignoscas, quaeso.

2. Subjunctive follows:

a) *quaeso*.

Circ. 432: quaeso ut ei detur.

Circ. 517: Quaeso ut hanc cures.

Circ. 629: quaeso, ut mihi dicas.

Capt. 949: Sed quaeso hominem ut jubeas arcessi.

Vid. 39: quaesso ut mihi impertias.

Bacch. 1019: Quaeso ut sat habeas id.

Rud. 1119: quaeso cistulam ut jubeas hunc reddere.

Merc. 678: Apollo, quaeso te, ut des pacem propitius,

Meoque ut parcas gnato.

Capt. 747: hoc quaeso ut mi ejus facias conveniundi copiam.

Amph. 324: quaeso in parietem ut primum domes.

Amph. 1037: quaeso ut advocatus mi adsis.

Trin. 189: te quaeso ut me juves Communicesque hanc mecum meam provinciam.

Aul. 611: id te quaeso ut prohibessis.

Miles, 1362: Quaeso ut memineris.

Bacch. 746: te quaeso ut memineris.

Capt. 1025: Compeditibus quaeso ut tibi sit levior filius.

Rud. 834: quaeso . . . abire ut liceat.

Men. Prol. 4: quaeso ut benignis auribus accipiatis.

b) *obsecro* (often combined with *oro*).

Truc. 841: te obsecro ut tuani gnatam des mihi.

Men. 1007 : opsecro te operam mihi ut des.

Most. 1036 : te obsecro, ut me bene juves operamque des.

Cis. 767 : te opsecro ut reddas mihi.

Merc. 179 : Obsecro hercle te, istuc ut tu mihi malum facias.

Curc. 630 : obsecro ut nos facias certiores.

Curc. 696 : Obsecro, Planesium auxilium ut feras.

Truc. 826 : obsecro . . . ut tu istuc feras Mihi que ignoscas.

As. 38 : Teque obsecro hercle, ut quae locutu's despicias.

Miles, 1408 : Opsecro hercle te, ut mea verba audias.

Cis. 453 : Opsecro te ut sinas.

Merc. 170 : Obsecro hercle oroque ut istuc indices.

Amph. 388 : Obsecro ut per pacem liceat alloqui.

Poen. 1342 : Opsecro te Suspendere ut me liceat.

Poen. 1362 : obsecro te ut liceat simplum solvere.

Rud. 1090 : Unum te obsecro, ut tecum hujus commiserescat.

Merc. 1001 : Obsecro Satis iam ut habeatis.

Rud. 1137 : opsecro te ut mea mihi reddantur.

Rud. 694 : te obsecramus nos ut recipias et tutere.

c) *rogo*

Men. 1154 : (Rogo) Praeconium mihi ut detis.

d) *oro*.

Bacch. 909 : Immo oro ut facias.

Amph. 1144 : te oro promissa ut serves tua.

Bacch. 1177 : Immo ego te oro ut me intro abducas.

Epid. 728 : Oro te, Epidice, Mihi ut ignoscas.

Rud. 773 : (oro) Ut illas serves, vim defendas.

Bacch. 494 : hoc tecum oro ut illius animum regas.

As. 432 : oro Mea causa ut mittas.

Capt. 210 : (oro) Ut nobis detis locum loquendi.

e) *amo*.

Cis. 104, Nunc te amabo, ut hanc hic sinas esse.

Truc. 872 : amabo ut sinas Eum esse apud me.

f) *obtestor*.

Rud. 635 : te obtestor Ut mihi istuc dicas.

Aul. 791 : te obtestor, Euclio Ut mi ignoscas eamque uxorem mihi des.

g) invoco.

Merc. 864 : Invoco Vos, Lares viales, ut me bene tutetis.

h) genua amplector.

Rud. 274 : Nunc tibi amplectimur genua Ut tuo recipias tecto servesque nos, Miseriaruinque te ambarum ut misereat.

DERIVED USES.

Extensions Within the Present.

a) oro.

Miles, 1145 : abiit oratum Ab se ut abeat.

Most. 797 : Orat ut suadeam Philolacheti.

Bacch. 42 : ita me orat sibi aliquem ut hominem reperiam.

Ps. 1273 : Orant med ut saltem.

Bacch. 825 : orabis me quidem ultiro ut auferam.

Mil. 1317 : Orant te ut eas.

Cis. 639 : Dic me orare ut aliquis intus prodeat.

Merc. 997 : Ora, ut ignoscat delictis tuis.

Bacch. 697 : Quem si orem ut mihi nil credat.

Merc. 665 : orabo ut conquistores det mihi.

Merc. 488 : Achillem orabo, aurum ut mihi det Hector.

Men. 672 : orabo ut mihi pallam reddat.

Cas. 42 : orat, ut eam det tibi.

Epid. 155 : te orabit ut illam tramittas sibi.

Poen. 1015 : orat operam ut des sibi.

Poen. 1024 : (orat) sub cratim ut jubeas se supponi.

Amph. Prol. 64 : Nunc hoc me orare a vobis jussit Juppiter
Ut conquistores Eant per totam caveam ; ut togae capiantur.

Cas. 21 : Vos omnes opere magno esse oratos volo
ut operam detis.

Aul. 739 : Id adeo te oratum advenio, ut ignoscas
mihi.

Cas. 44 : orat, ut eam curet, educet.

As. 740: patrem huc orato ut veniat.

Cas. 704: Dic me uxorem orare, ut exoret illam.

Aul. 817: orabo ut manu me emittat.

Merc. 104: oro ut vendat milii.

b) *obsecro.*

Rudens, 876: me obsecras ut te sequar?

Mil. 971: obsecrare jussit ut eam copiam sibi . . . facias.

Mil. 1385: intro te ut eas obsecrat.

Stich. 299: opsecret se ut nuntio hoc impertiam.

Truc. 592: ut huc veniat obsecra.

Capt. 513: orat obsecratque, Euni sibi ut liceat videre.

Mil. 69: exobsecrant Videre ut liceat.

c) *rogo.*

As. 170: ut remittam ad te rogas.

Pers. 600: roga ut tibi percontari liceat.

Rud. 1212: roga ut relinquat alias res et huc veniat.

Merc. 787: rogato meum patrem . . . Ut veniat ad me.

Cure. 330: argenti rogo ut faciat copiam.

Trin. 20: rogat Ut liceat.

d) *mentionem facio.*

Aul. 204: ubi mentionem ego fecero . . Mi ut despondeat.

e) *invoco.*

Amph. 1093: Invocat deos immortales, ut sibi auxilium ferant.

f) *paucis (verbis) mitto.*

Bacch. 589: Paucis me misit miles Vel ut ducentos Philippos reddat aureos Vel ut hinc in Elatiam hodie eat.

g) *invito.*

Trin. 27: ni id me invitet ut faciam fides.

h) *amo.*

Men. 524: Menaechme, amare ait te multum Erotium,

Ut hoc una opera ad aurificei deferas,

Atque huc ut addas auri pondo unciam

Jubeasque splinter novom reconcinnarier.

i) *on context.*

Men. 736 quaere meum patrem, . . . ut veniat.

Extensions in Tense.

Imperfect.

a) *oro.**Vid.* 84 : oravisti ut darem.*Merc.* 542 : oravit Ut apud me praehiberem locum.*As.* 74 : oravit . . . Ut sibi . . . facerem argenti copiam.*Cas.* 543 : me oravit, ut . . . mitterem.*Trin.* 449 : oravit filius, Ut tuam sororem poscerem.*Bacch.* 554 : orarem ut ei quod posses mali Facere faceres.*Truc.* 582 : Jussit orare ut haec grata haberet.*Most.* 752 : hoc orare jussit . . . Ut sibi liceret.*Cis.* 84 : oranti Ut me . . . sinueret.*Curc.* 425 : id te orare jusserat . . . ut faceres.*Poen.* 1134 : Oratum ierunt deam, ut sibi esset propitia.*Miles,* 75 : oravit . . . Ut sibi latrones cogerem et conscriberem.*Poen.* 601 : oraveris, Liberum ut commostraremus tibi locum.*Most.* 421 : orare, ut patrem aliquo absterreres modo.*Bacch.* 788 : Orabat . . . ut fieret.*Pers.* 117 : oravi, ut nūmmos sescentos mihi Dares.*Men.* 688 : Nec oravi te ut dares.*Cas.* 532 : orabat Ut properarem.b) *rogo.**Rud.* 601 : Videtur . . . Rogare scalas ut darem.*St.* 248 : Rogare jussit te . . . Mecum ut ires.c) *rogito.**Truc.* 797 : rogitavit . . . ut afferretur eaque ut celarentur.d) *obsecro.**Miles,* 66 : obsecraverint Ut te praeterducerem ?*Cas.* 993 : opsecravisti . . . ut poscerem.e) *postulo.**Aul.* 318 : Infit ibi postulare, plorans, ejulans, Ut liceret.f) *mentionem facere.**Cist.* 134 : mentionem fecerat ut reperirem.

g) *expeto.*

Men. 762^b: expetit me ut ad sese irem.

h) *veneror.*

Aul. 8: Defodit venerans me, ut id servarem.

i) *litteras (epistulas) mitto.*

Bacch. 389: litteras Misi, ut inveniret.

Bacch. 561: misine ego ad te epistulam ut invenires?

j) *tabellas do.*

Miles, 130: tabellas dedi ut is huc veniret.

Passive Extension.

Miles, 1405: Oratus sum, ad eam ut irem.

Extensions by analogy of the meaning of the verb (See p. 12).

Cas. 270: impetro, Ut eam illi permittat.

Cas. 106: si impetravero Uxorem ut istam ducam.

Cas. 339: hoc impetramus, ut ego cum Casina cubem.

Capt. 515: ut impetres eum hominem ut convenias.

Merc. 544: impetravi, ut egomet me—corrumperem.

Poen. 815: impetravimus, Ut perderemus.

Miles, 1208: Impetrare, ut abiret.

Cas. 364: impetrare Casina ut uxor mihi daretur.

Trin. 1168: (volo impetrare) ut ea missum facias omnia.

Men. 1048: Sei possum exorare, ut pallam reddat.

Ps. 75: non queo Lacrumam exorare ut expuam.

Rud. 1218: exores Plesidippum, ut me manu emittat.

Cas. 269: si exoro a vilico, Ut eam illi permittat?

Cas. 705: ut exoret illam Gladium ut ponat et redire me intro ut liceat.

Bacch. 689: (exoravisti) ut faceret.

Bacch. 1170: sine me hoc exorare . . . ut . . . desistas.

As. 916: exorari spero poterit ut sinat.

Aul. 309: Censen talentum magnum exorari potis Ab istoc senne, ut det qui fiamus liberi?

There is an anacolouthon here, *talentum* could not be the sub-

ject of *ut det* as it is of *exorari potis*. The *ut det* must depend on some feeling for *exorare senem ut det*, or *senem exorari ut det*.

Here apparently belongs the following :

St. 746 : Nimioque sibi mulier meretrix repperit odium ocium
Sua immunditia quam in perpetuum ut placeat munditia sua.

Here *quam* clearly suggests the notion of *quam impetrat*, which naturally gives rise to the construction *ut placeat*.

Interrogative Extensions.

Men. 424 : Sed scin quid te amabo ut facias ?

C. Subjunctive with ne. (Verbs of Begging, Requesting, etc.)

ORIGINAL USES.

a) *quaeso.*

Amph. 1037 : *quaeso . . . neve abeas.*

Circ. 400 : *quaeso ne me incomities.*

As. 400 : *quaeso ne vitio vortas.*

Bacch. 1013 : *quaeso, pater Ne me deseras.*

Aul. 210 : *Quaeso ne id te pigeat proloqui.*

b) *obsecro.*

Circ. 605 : *obsecro parentes ne meos mihi prohibeas.*

Men. 1007 : *opsecro te Neu sinas . . . fieri tantam injuriam.*

Poen. 1405 : *nequid tibi cum istoc . . . siet . . . obsecro.*

Most. 744 : *obsecro, Ne indicium ero facias meo.*

Men. 1032 : *sed, patrone, te obsecro, Ne minus imperes mihi.*

Capt. 443 : *Opsecro, infidelior mihi ne fuas.*

c) *oro.*

Capt. 243 : *nunc te oro per precem, . . . Ne me secus honore honestes.*

d) *obtestor.*

Capt. 727 : *te obtestor, Hegio Ne tu istunc hominem perdiuis.*

Capt. 319: optestor, Hegio, Ne tuom animum avariorem faxint divitiae meae.

e) *venero*.

Bacch. 173: veneroque te, ne me sinas convenire.

DERIVED USES.

Extensions within the Present.

Rud. 605: Ago cum illa nequid noceat.

Cis. 567: obsecrans ne deserat se.

Cas. 321: orat, obsecrat ne Casinam uxorem ducam.

Extensions in Tense.

Imperfect.

Cas. 430: expetivisse ne ea mihi daretur.

Trin. 154: obsecravit suo ne gnato crederem.

Extensions by analogy of the meaning of the verb (p. 12).

Cis. 302: Eamque exores, ne tibi suscenseat.

Bacch. 521: exorabo, Pater ne noceat neu quid ei suscenseat.

Bacch. 690: (exoravi) tibi ne noceat neu suscenseat.

Cas. 304: exoraverit ne Casinam ducat.

As. 946: deprecari huic seni ne vapulet.

There is a single instance with *ni*, viz. *Men.* 880: quaeso Ni me indicetis.

D. Subjunctive with *ut ne*. (Verbs of *Begging*, *Requesting*, etc.)

ORIGINAL USES.

a) *obsecro*.

Poen. 392: Opsecro Ut tu huic irata ne sis.

b) *quaeso*.

Rud. 627 f.: quaeso Ut te ne pigeat.

DERIVED USES.

Extensions in Tense.

Imperfect.

Pers. 109: (mentionem feceras) ut muraena et conger ne calefierent.

Extension by analogy of the meaning of the verb (p. 12).

Bacch. 533: (exoravi) ut nequid ei suscenseat.

4. WITH VERBS OF ADVISING, INCLUDING (AS EXTENSIONS) VERBS OF INDUCING AND (AS EXTENSIONS OF VERBS OF INDUCING) ALSO VERBS OF COMPELLING.

A. Subjunctive alone.

ORIGINAL USES.

No instances occur. But *Men.* 569: *male habeas: sic censeo* suggests the original form of construction.

DERIVED USES.

Extensions within the Present.

Merc. 1015: Immo dicamus senibus legem censeo.

As. 644: quod faciamus nobis suades.

Trin. 681: meam sororem tibi dem suades.

Poen. 730: censem hominem interrogem.

Extension by analogy of the meaning of the verb (see below, p. 38).

Rud. 681^a: Quae vis vim mi afferam ipsa adigit.

B. Subjunctive with *ut*.

ORIGINAL USES.

1. Subjunctive precedes.

Capt. 240: ted ut memineris moneo.

Circ. 163: ut sistas suadeo.

Trin. 107: Id ita esse ut credas tem, tibi auctorem dabo.

2. Subjunctive follows:

a) *moneo, suadeo.*

St. 42: Moneo ut tuom memineris officium.

Trin. 674: moneo hoc ut reputes.

Rud. 879: suadeo Ut ad nos abeant potius.

b) *auctor sum.*

Merc. 312: auctor sum ut me amando enices.

Poen. 721: (auctores sumus) Ut frugi sies.

Aul. 251: auctor sum, ut tu me quo vis castrandum loces.

Poen. 410: (auctor sum) Ut me verberes Atque auctionem facias.

c) *canto.*

Trin. 287^b: canto ut caveas.

d) *verbum, sententia* = 'advice'.

Circ. 31: Quid istuc est verbi? PA. Caute ut incedas via.

Ps. 379: Haec meast sententia, ut tu consulas.

DERIVED USES.

Extensions within the Present.

a) *suadeo.*

Most. 797: Orat ut suadeam Philolacheti Ut istas remittat sibi.

Rud. 53: suadere, ut secum simul Eat in Siciliam.

Bacch. 812: suadeas gnato meo Ut pergraecetur.

Most. 215: ne suadeas, ut illum minoris pendam.

As. 914: ut decumbamus suadebo.

b) *hortor.*

Pers. 842: hortantur, tuo ut imperio paream.

Miles, 1189: hortabitur, Ut eat, ut properet.

Cas. 422: hortemur, ut properent.

Poen. 672: hortamini Ut devortatur ad me.

c) *auctor sum.*

St. 128: auctores ita sunt, ut hinc abducam.

d) *consilium do.*

St. 74: consilium dabo . . . ut exoremus.

Here also I should put the following:

Circ. 558: venit in mentem mihi . . . argentum ut petam,
i. e., 'the suggestion presents itself.'

Ps. 134: venit in mentem ut recte faciant.

Poen. 1340: omiibus amicis convenit ut me suspendam, *i. e.*, they all agree in advising me to hang myself.

Extensions in Tense.

Imperfect.

St. 581 : ita mi auctores fuere, ut egomet me hodie jugularem.

Trin. 642 : hanc majores famam tradiderunt tibi tui ut virtute eorum anteparta . . . perderes Atque . . . ut vindex fieres?

Interrogative Extensions.

Merc. 483 : quo leto censes me ut peream potissimum?

Miles, 1094 : Quid nunc mihi's auctor ut faciam.

Poen. 730 : censem interrogem?

Ps. 231 : mihi's auctor ut mittam?

Rud. 1275 : (censem) salutem?

Rud. 1277 : (censem) complectar?

Negative Extension.

St. 73 : Neque ut facias consilium dabo.

Extensions by analogy of the meaning of the verb.

A. *With verbs of inducing.*

That the subjunctive with verbs of this meaning is purely an extension after the analogy of verbs of *urging* seems a necessary conclusion for two reasons: (1) Their meaning is incompatible with any theory of a jussive origin, *e. g.*, we cannot imagine an original type of expression such as an *abeas*, *persuadeo* in the sense of 'depart: I persuade you,' for such a collocation would be meaningless. (2) In striking confirmation of the foregoing impossibility is the fact that verbs of *inducing* are never found in Plautus with subjunctives which can be regarded as representing the original type. Cf. the similar extension by analogy of meaning noted above (p. 12) in connection with *exoro* and *impetro*.

a) *animum induco.*

St. 346 : Animum inducam ut arbitrer.

Poen. 877 : Animum inducam facile, ut eredam.

Cis. 633 : animum ego inducam tamen, Ut consulam.

Epid. 550 : animum inducam ut tu noveris.

b) *induco.*

As. 494: Numquam hodie induces ut tibi credam.

Miles, 254: Inducamus ut credat.

Merc. 349: nec pater potis videtur Induci, ut putet.

c) *perpello.*

Epid. 87: perpuli ut censeret.

Bacch. 644: perpuli ut crederet.

d) *persuadeo.*

Bacch. 964: persuasit se ut amitteret.

Merc. 331: persuadere Ut illam vendat.

Truc. 201: persuaderes ut abortioni operam daret puerumque ut enicaret.

e) *perduco.*

Most. 198: nequis perduci ut vera haec credas.

f) *exsculpo.*

Cis. 541: exculpsi ut diceret.

g) *animum domo.*

Cas. 252: domuisti animum ut facias.

B. With verbs of forcing.

No original uses with verbs of *forcing* occur, and this can hardly cause surprise; for an originally paratactic *cogo abeas* is logically inconceivable. The only explanation of the substantive clause with such verbs seems to be that they are a further extension by analogy of meaning of verbs of *inducing* (p. 37). Just so soon as *eum perpuli ut abiret* came to be a part of the mechanism of the language, just so soon an *eum subegi ut abiret* could be counted on as its inevitable successor.

a) *subigo.*

Ps. 808: me nemo potest ut surgam subigere.

Trin. 848: Quin ego nunc subigor ut Dicam.

Miles, 1006: subigit me ut amem.

Circ. 540: subiges, redditum ut reddam tibi.

St. 193: subigunt med, ut Discam atque ut faciam Itaque praedicem.

Ps. 8 : subigit ut te rogitem.

Pers. 194 : Nec subigi queantur ut habeant.

Epid. 235 : subigunt ut faciant.

Poen. 290 : lapidem silicem subigere, ut se amet, potest.

Rud. 703 : ut faciant subigit.

Most. 1174 : ut sit subegero.

Most. 917 : subegi ut sumeret.

b) *cogo.*

Most. 893 : Non potes cogere ut maledicam.

Men. 877 : cogunt, ut insaniam?

Ps. 206 : ut serviant Suos amor cogit?

Bacch. 508 : cogam ut mendicet.

C. Subjunctive with ne.

ORIGINAL USES.

1. Subjunctive precedes.

Pers. 680 : ne permittas domum, Moneo.

2. Subjunctive follows.

Ps. 915 : Monendu's ne me moneas.

DERIVED USES.

Extensions within the Present.

St. 608 : suades ne bitat.

Cas. 341 : instat, ne mihi detur.

Extension in Tense.

Imperfect.

As. 462 : Suassisne sibi ne crederes.

Extensions by analogy of the meaning of the verb.

With verbs of inducing (See p. 37).

Miles, 568 : Vincam animum meum, Ne arbitrer.

As. 832 : Possum equidem inducere animum, ne aegre patiar.

Miles, 1269 : Induxi in animum ne oderim.

Miles, 187 : Ut vinclat ne is se viderit.

Merc. 331 : Huic persuadere neve det.

D. Subjunctive with ut ne.

ORIGINAL USES.

None occur.

DERIVED USES.

Extension in Tense.

Imperfect.

Epid. 355 : ita suasi seni atque hanc habui orationem, ut
ne tibi ejus copia esset.

5. CONSTRUCTIONS WITH FACIO ('SEE TO IT.'¹)**A. Subjunctive alone.**

ORIGINAL USES.

1. Subjunctive precedes.

Amph. 981 : haec curata sint Fac sis.

Poen. 1035 : linguam compescas face.

Asin. 726 : animo sis bono face.

Miles, 812 : praecepta sobrie adcures face.

Most. 854 : aliquis abducat face.

Poen. 1414 : amicam mihi des facito aut reddas minam.

2. Subjunctive follows.

Capt. 439 : Fac fidelis sis fideli.

Ps. 481 : fac sis promissi memor.

Mil. 1360 : Fac sis frugi.

Amph. 979 : fac commentus sis.

Cure. 521 : Fac sis bonae frugi sies.

Ps. 236 : fac possis.

Cas. 421 : fac accures.

Amph. 976 : fac adsis, Sosia.

¹ Logically this category is practically coincident with the constructions with *video*, *curo*, *operam do*, but the extensive material under the different heads suggests the advisability of treating each verb separately.

Pers. 195: has tabellas fac des et quae jussi nuntiato.

Pers. 438: fac sit mulier libera, Atque huc continuo adduce.

Ps. 190: Fac sis sit delatum huc mihi frumentum.

Most. 400: aedes iam fac occlusae sient.

Cas. 527: Fac habeant linguam tuae aedes.

Amph. 971: I sane, et parata fac sint omnia.

Aul. 273: curata fac sint.

Cas. 521: Fac vacent aedes.

Merc. 498: ergo actuum face cum praeda recipias.

Pers. 198: face rem hanc cum cura geras.

Ps. 157: face plenum alienum sit coco.

Corn. VII (*Fab. incert.* 70): Face olant aedes arabice.

Men. 992: Facite ablatus sublimen siet.

Capt. 736: In lapicidinas facite deductus siet.

Men. 866: facilitate sonitus unguilarum appareat, Cursu celeri facite inflexa sit pedum pernicietas.

Rud. 621: Facite hic lege potius liceat.

Cas. 146: facite hinc accersatis.

Bacch. 754: facite accubitum teatis Atque potetis.

Ps. 181: facite ante aedis iam hic adsint.

Aul. 407: facite totae plateae pateant.

Poen. 1084: Facito sis reddas.

As. 238: syngraphum facito adferas.

Trin. 485: Semper tu hoc facito, Lesbonice, cogites.

Most. 216: At hoc unum facito cogites.

Poen. 1418: Facto in memoria habeas.

Poen. 1278: Patrue, facito in memoria habeas.

Cas. 523: Sed facitodum merula quod cantat colas.

Pers. 445: facito mulier ad me transeat.

Bacch. 96: Tu facito opsonatum nobis sit opulentium opsonium.

Rud. 1219: Et tua filia facito oret.

Ps. 166: sumen facito in aqua jaceant.

DERIVED USES.

Extensions within the Present.

Men. 890: fac sciām.

- Trin.* 174: fac sciam.
Circ. 617: fac sciam.
Circ. 414: fac sciam.
Miles, 277: fac sciam.
Rud. 1023: faciūm ex te sciam.
Ps. 696^a: quid vis facere fac sciam.
Epid. 567: Fac videam.
Poen. 893: Fac ergo id facile noscam ego.

Extension in Tense.

Imperfect.

- St.* 177: paupertas fecit ridiculus forem.

Extensions with *faciam*, *faxo*, and *faxim*.

With these forms, even where *ut* is absent, it seems unnatural to interpret the object clause as representing an original use, *e.g.*, *faxo scias* does not naturally lend itself to the interpretation, ‘Know; I’ll make you.’ It seems altogether more likely that *faxo scias* is an extension after the analogy of such expressions as, *Men.* 866: *facitote sonitus unguilarum appareat*. In this expression, and many similar ones, we must recognize undoubtedly original uses, but in these original uses the idea of causation easily developed, thus paving the way for the free use of the subjunctive after forms of *facio* in cases where an original parataxis is inconceivable. This is especially true after *faciam*, *faxo*, *faxim*, as may be seen by the following examples:

- Amph.* 876: faciam res fiat palam.
Amph. Prol. 63: Faciam sit, tragicomedia.
Mil. 1398: faciam pendeant crepundia.
ut faciam AP. Leo perhaps rightly reads *ut ea iam* and makes the line depend on the preceding one.
Amph. 589: faxo ista expetant mendacia.
Men. 540: Et palla et spinter faxo referantur.
Most. 1133: ego ferare faxo.
Trin. 62: Ne tu hercle faxo hand nescias.
Ps. 949: tum faxo magis id dicas.

Men. 644 : faxo scias.

Men. 113 : faxo foris vidua visas patrem.

Circ. 587 : faxo reperias.

There is a minor variant for the future indicative here.

As. 876 : Jam faxo ipsum hominem manufesto opprinas.

Trin. 882 : Et meum nomen et mea facta et itinera ego faxo scias.

Most. 68 : Eruom tibi aliquis cras faxo ad villam adferat.

Bacch. 864 : faxo . . . haud dicat.

Amph. 972 : faxo haud quicquam sit morae.

Truc. 643 : Ego faxo dicat me Crudum virum esse.

Amph. 511 : faxim ted Amphitruonem esse malis.

Aul. 494 : faxim muli Sint viores Gallicis cautheris.

Merc. 826. faxim Plures viri sint vidui.

Truc. 63^a : Faxim Et minus damnosorum hominum siet.

Truc. 348 : nulla faxim cis dies panceos siet.

Trin. 222 : Pauci sint faxim Occlusioremque habeant stultiloquentiam.

Pers. 73 : faxim nusquam appareant.

Amph. 632 : Utinam di faxint, infecta dicta re eveniant tua.

Ussing and others bracket this ; cf. Leo, *ad loc.*

B. Subjunctive with ut.

ORIGINAL USES.

1. Subjunctive precedes.

Pers. 526 : ut accipiat face.

Trin. 800 : uti celes face.

2. Subjunctive follows.

Most. 1145 : Fac ut tu meam timeas vicem.

Rud. 1218 : Fac ut exores Plesidippum.

Rud. 698 : Fac ut ulciscare nosque ut hanc tua pace aram ob-sidere patiare.

Amph. 978 : Fac Amphitruonem advenientem Ut abigas.

As. 824 : Tu ergo fac ut illi turbas, lites concias.

Amph. 981 : haec curata sint, Fac sis, Atque ut ministres mihi.

Capt. 337 : Fac is homo ut redimatur.

Poen. 580 : Fac modo ut concocta tibi sint dicta.

Cas. 714 : Face ut impetres.

Ps. 210 : face ut animum advortas.

Men. 948 : Ad me face uti deferatur.

As. 90 : Face id ut paratum jam sit.

Men. 1014 : Face ut oculi locus in capite appareat.

Bacch. 327 : Anulum guati tui Facito ut memineris ferre.

Miles. 354 : Praecepta facito ut memineris.

Ps. 515 : Facito ut memineris.

Aul. 257 : illud facito ut memineris.

Curc. 210 : Facito ut memineris.

St. 519 : nam hoc tu facito ut cogites.

Merc. 565 : Quod opus facto, facito ut cogites.

Men. 437 : Tu facito ante solem occasum ut venias advorsum mihi.

Mil. 1177 : Facito ut venias ornatus huc ad nos nauclerico.

Merc. 279 : Uxori facito ut nunties negotium.

Merc. 278 : facito ut coram tradas in manum.

Cis. 62 : facito ut facias stultitiam sepelibilem.

Bacch. 1153 : Facito ut facias.

Curc. 213 : facito ut pretio pervincas tuo.

Bacch. 36 : facito ut subvenias, soror.

Capt. 689 : Facito ergo ut Acherunti clueas gloria.

Cis. 64 : Tuam stultitiam sola facito ut scias.

Pers. 388 : facito ut veniat in mentem tibi.

Cas. 524 : facito ut veniant.

Miles. 1395 : Facite inter terram atque caelum ut sit.

Cas. 746 : facite Cenam mihi ut ebria sit.

Most. 78 : Facite huc ut redeat noster quam primum senex.

Poen. 1390 : Facite ut vostro subveniatis supplici.

St. 309 : fores facite ut pateant.

Pers. 92 : Collyrae facite ut madeant.

Ps. 177 : Facite hodie ut mihi munera multa convenient.

St. 65 : Facite sultis nitidae ut aedes meae sint.

DERIVED USES.

Extensions within the Present.

Rud. 1088 : Fac aurum ut videam.

St. 148 : facito ut sciam.

Truc. 478 : Face ut accumbam.

Poen. 422 : Fac Ut ego hunc lenonem perdam.

Circ. 314 : Obsecro hercle, facite ventum ut gaudeam.

Ps. 163 : facite ut offendam parata lautaque uncta-
que omnia uti sint.

Ps. 696^c : fac ut sciām.

Extensions after *facio* in the developed sense of 'cause';
'make'; 'bring about' 'make out' (see above, p. 42).

a) Present Indicative.

Pers. 382 : ut fiam facis.

Cis. 645 : ut vivam facis.

Rud. 244 : facis ut velim.

Amph. 555 : facis ut nulla fides sit.

Miles, 341 : facio ut videoas.

Ps. 849 : facio ut opera appareat.

b) Future Indicative.

Trin. 233 : hoc sic faciam, opinor, Ut exputem, judex
sim.

Men. 1061 : Facietis ut abstulerim.

Amph. 298 : faciet ut dormiam.

Miles, 661 : ut fateare faciam.

As. 739 : Haec faciet facile ut patiar.

Amph. 1085 : faciam ut praedices.

Capt. 856 : faciam, ut cupias.

Circ. 691 : faciam ut accubes.

Rud. 1088 : faciam ut videoas.

Aul. 443 : Ego te faciam miserrimus mortalis uti sis.

Ps. 214 : faciam ut deportere.

Capt. 610 : faciam ut reperiare.

As. 28 : te faciam ut scias.

Amph. 583 : faciam Ut minus valeas et miser sis.

Amph. 345: faciam ut serum dicas.

Amph. 613: faciam ut offendas.

Pers. 743: faciam ut lamenteris.

Amph. 549: brevior dies ut fiat faciam.

As. 140: faciam ut scias.

Poen. 197: Faciam ut facto gaudeas.

Poen. 165: Ego faciam ut facias.

Pers. 494: faciam ut mei memineris.

Capt. 800: Faciam ut meminerit.

Pers. 47: te faciam ut scias.

Epid. 606: exitiabilem illi faciam hunc ut fiat diem.

Capt. 962: At ego faciam ut pudeat.

Aul. 31: faciam ut poscat.

As. 647: faciam ut amplexetur.

Poen. 1289: faciam ut sit.

Cas. 157: Faciam uti colat.

Amph. Prol. 59: Faciam ut sit.

Amph. Prol. 54: faciam ut sit.

Capt. 409: faciam ut faciat.

Poen. 702: faciam ut faciat.

Most. 390: faciam ut fugiat.

St. 445: faciam ut sit.

Rud. 1084: Faciam ut det.

Capt. 65: faciam ut inspectet.

Ps. 884: faciam ut praerodat.

Amph. 878: Faciam ut pariat.

Amph. 1001: faciam ut sit.

Circ. 692: at ego (faciam) Ut pereatis.

Circ. 576: faciam ut differant.

Aul. 365: faciam ut coquant.

Pers. 760: faciam ut fiant.

Poen. 372: faciet ut sis civis Attica.

Here I should also place the two following examples:

Merc. 712: Quid nunc faciam nisi uti adeam atque adloquar?

Ps. 1101: Non edepol scio: Nisi ut observemus quo eat.

The first of these examples seems to be fairly clear. *Nisi* naturally involves the ellipsis of *faciam*. *Uti adeam* depends on

this *faciam* in the sense of 'I'll attend to approaching him.' In the second example, it does not seem to be too bold to supply with *nisi* substantially the same idea as is so distinctly involved in the first.

c) *Perfect Indicative*.

Aul. 797 : feci ut esses.

Bacch. 352 : feci, ut sumeret ut reddat patre.

Aul. 26 : Feci, thensaurum ut hic reperiret.

Capt. 931 : fecisti ut possim.

Trin. 746 : fecisti ut foret.

Capt. 411 : fecisti ut redire liceat.

Amph. 298 : Fecit ut vigilarem.

Amph. 598 : fecit sibi uti crederem.

Miles, 1257 : Venus fecit eam ut divinaret.

d) *Present Subjunctive*.

Pers. 823 : faciant ut id bibatis.

Aul. 545 : di faciant ut siet.

Amph. 380 : faciant, ut sis atque ut verberem.

Miles, 346 : faciat ut ea sit.

Poen. 489 : Juppiter Faciat ut semper sacrificem nec unquam litem.

Truc. 966 : faciat ut sciam.

e) *faxo, faxim*.

As. 902 : faxo ut scias.

Ps. 923^e : Ita ille faxit Juppiter Ut adsiet.

f) *Infinitives*.

Pers. 414 : Possum te facere ut accipias.

Amph. Prol. 60 : facere ut sit.

Poen. 442 : si nequeo facere ut abeas.

Poen. 454 : nec potui facere uti esset.

Truc. 816 : Numquam te facere quivi ut dices.

Poen. 864 : illum ut perdant facere possum Meum erum ut perdant.

Ps. 1100 : Facere ut det.

Miles, 1322 : potis es facere ut affluat.

Pers. 685: facere ut remigret.

Most. 423: facturum ut fugiat.

Circ. 555: quid refert me fecisse Ut oboedirent?

g) *opus est facto, usus est facto.*

Merc. 566: opus hoc facto existumo, Ut eam.

Rud. 398: usus factost, Ut eam intro consolerque.

Extension by analogy meaning of the verb.

As. 103: Perficito ut habeat.

Perficere has here the meaning of ‘to succeed in one’s effort’, and bears the same relation to *facio* that *persuadeo* does to *suadeo*, see above, p. 37. Similar also is the following example:

Most. 416: Efficiam Profecto ut liqueant omnia et tranquilla sint Neque quicquam nobis pariant incommodi.

Here also I should put the four following:

Most. 706: Exsequi certa res est, ut abeam.

I. e., *exsequi* having the same meaning as *efficere* and *perficere* takes the same construction. Cf. the similar use of *consequor* and *adsequor*. That the substantive clause with all of these has jussive associations seems clear from the occurrence of the negative *ne*, e.g., Cic. *ad Fam.* i, 2, 4: *hoc videmur esse consecuti ut ne quid agi cum populo possit*; Curt. iv, 14, 4: *Macedonas assecutos ne quis toto locus esset*; Cic. *pro Milone* 13, 34: *adepti estis ne quem civem metueretis*.

Amph. 1055: videntur omnia consequi, Jam ut opprimar, ut enicer.

Cas. 701: perpetrem ut nubat mihi.

Pers. 237: numquam . . istuc exterebrabis tu ut sis peior quam ego siem.

C. Subjunctive with *ne*.

ORIGINAL USES.

None occur.

DERIVED USES.

Extensions within the Present.

Most. 1145 : *Fac ego ne metuam.*

Extensions after *facio*, ‘make,’ ‘cause’ (see above, p. 42).

Most. 389 : *ita patrem faciam tuom Non modo ne intro eat.*

Faciam does not here mean ‘to bring to pass,’ but ‘make,’ ‘to see to it,’ as regularly. Morris, *Introd. Captivi*, 36 a), says: “*ne (ut ne)* is used in consecutive (result) clauses as well as in final (purpose) clauses,” and cites this instance along with the following: *Capt.* 737 : *ita curarier, ne qui deterius huic sit quam qui pessum est;* *Capt.* 267 : *Ne id quidem, involucrum iuicere, voluit, vestem ut ne inquiet;* *Most.* 1053 : *Pergunt turbare usque, ut ne quid possit conquiescere.* But despite the employment of *ita* in one of these passages, I should maintain that all are purpose clauses, in which *ita* regularly, if not quite universally, in Plautus, is merely prospective, not intensive. It may be translated by ‘with this in view,’ ‘with reference to this end,’ etc. Cf. Bennett, *Critique*, p. 10. It would be just as easy to maintain a consecutive clause in *Merc.* 279–280 (*Uxori facito ut nunties negotium mihi esse in urbe, ne me expectet*) as in the three passages cited by Morris (cf. Brix on *Miles*, 149). All four passages admit, to be sure, of translation in English ‘so that . . . not,’ but we should not be misled to regard this expression as necessarily conveying a consecutive notion, particularly if a purpose or a intensive notion is manifested in a given passage.

Poen. 909 : *Ita dei faxint ne apud lenouem hunc serviam.*

Cis. 523 : *Faxint ne ego oppingam vivos savium.*

oppingam here is Schöll’s conjecture.

D. Subjunctive with *ut ne*.

ORIGINAL USES.

None occur.

DERIVED USES.

The instances are all after *facere* ‘make’, ‘cause’.

Most. 423 : *Facturum ut ne etiam aspicere aedis audeat.*

Miles, 149: etimque ita Faciemus ut quod viderit ne viderit.

Note that in this last example we have also a Perfect Extension.

6. WITH CURO AND EXPRESSIONS OF STRIVING.

A. Subjunctive alone.

No instances occur.

B. Subjunctive with *ut*.

ORIGINAL USES.

Milcs, 1: Curate ut splendor meo sit clipeo.

Circ. 517: Quaeso ut hanc cures ut bene sit isti.

Pers. 527: cura ut curetur.

Bacch. 692: (cura) Ut ad senem etiam alteram facias viam.

Most. 208: istuc cures Ut te ille amet.

Mil. 165: Adecuratote ut domi agitent convivium.

Merc. 111: experire, nitere Erus ut servetur.

DERIVED USES.

Extensions within the Present.

Trin. 78: adecurare addecet, culpam ut ab se segregent.

Most. 128: Nituntur ut alii expetant.

We have two examples of a clause following *cura* (the noun) after the analogy of the verb *curare*:

Aul. 364: Quos pol ut servem cura maxumast.

St. 652: Curaest ut videam.

Poen. 575: Lenonem ut perjurum perdas, id studes.

Mil. 41: curamque adlibere ut praeolat mihi quod tu velis.

Amph. *Prol.* 13: admittier Lucrum ut perenne vobis semper suppeditat.

Miles, 1238: Istuc curavi ut opinione illius pulcrior sis.

Men. 548: me curaturum dicio Ut veneant.

Pers. 523: te volo curare ut istic veneat.

Pers. 608: Curabo ut praedati pulcre ad castra convertamini.

Trin. 1105: quae imperaverim Curare ut efferantur.

Miles, 577: scio quam rem gerat: Ut . . . Domi comprehendar.

Trin. 699 : id agis ut effugias, . . . deseris.

Trin. 718 : quid ego nunc agam . . . nisi uti constringam et . . . accommodem . . . jubeam?

Cas. 952 : quid nunc agam, nisi ut improbos famulos imiter a domo fugiam? Cf. the following incomplete sentence.

Most. 662 : quid ego nunc agam nisi ut in vicinum hunc proximum?

Schmalz, therefore, is in error when he says (*Synt.*³ § 325) : “*nisi ut* is der silbernen Latinität eigen.”

The following constructions with nouns are obvious extensions of the constructions already noted with verbs :

Miles. 237 : Hanc instituam astutiam : Ut . . . dicam.

Capt. 47 : Confinixerunt dolim Ut in servitute maneat.

Poen. 774 : fallacia ut eo me privent atque inter se dividant.

Bacch. 740 : sycophantias componit ut . . . auferat.

Mil. 767 : sycophantiam . . . uti hanc ecficiamus copiam.

Poen. 1099 : hanc fabricam apparo, ut te allegemus.

Note also the following instance with *qui* = *ut*, (see p. 6) :

Mil. 768 : sycophantiam qui admittiletur miles.

Passive Extensions.

Cas. 131 : Ut condigne te cibes curabitur.

Epid. 269 : curetur ut serviat.

Extensions in Tense.

Imperfect and Perfect.

Ps. 72 : ut scires curavi omnia.

Epid. 509 : curavisse ut fieret libera.

St. 679 : curavi . . . cena cocta ut esset.

Amph. 487 : Pater curavit uno ut fetu fieret.

Rud. 192 : curavi ut caverem.

Poen. 913 : haec cura clanculum ut sint dicta.

Ps. 1193 : te hanc fallaciam docuit ut . . . hinc mulierem a me abduceres.

Bacch. 392 : teclinam fecit . . . ut mihi amanti copia esset.

Bacch. 350 : haec tela ut amantem copem facerem filium.

Note also the following instance with *qui* (= *ut* :)

Mil. 138 : machinas qui facerem.

C. Subjunctive with ne.

ORIGINAL USES.

Curc. 30 : Semper curato ne sis intestabilis.

DERIVED USES.

Extensions within the Present.

Bacch. 1030 : ne perjerem cura.

Curc. 138 : Tu me curato ne sitiam.

D. Subjunctive with ut ne.

Trin. 688 : prospicere . . . ut inops infamis ne siem.

7. WITH VIDEO, 'SEE TO IT.'**A. Subjunctive alone.**

ORIGINAL USES.

1. Subjunctive precedes.

As. 755 : scribas vide.

2. Subjunctive follows.

Amph. 629 : vide ex navi efferantur.

Truc. 836 : vide facias.

Poen. 578 : vide, sis, calleas.

Truc. 913 : vide noveris.

B. Subjunctive with ut.

ORIGINAL USES.

Truc. 711 : vide ut tu tuom item efficias.

Miles, 1397 : Vide ut istic tibi sit acutus culter.

Pers. 607 : in proelium Vide ut ingrediare.

Most. 549^d : videto ut capias.

DERIVED USES.

Extensions within the Present.

Aul. 614 : Vide ut auferam.

Most. 412 : Verum id videndumst, id viri doctist opus, ut proveniant.

Epid. 37: videndumst ut suppetat.

C. Subjunctive with ne.

ORIGINAL USES.

Poen. 358: vide ne pectas.

Bacch. 201: Vide ne quis tractet.

Pers. 383: videto Ne faciat.

Bacch. 744: vide ne det.

Miles, 1279: Vide ne sies in exspectatione.

Pers. 28: Vide ne transfigant.

Capt. 584: vide nequid insistas.

Curc. 325: Vide ne me ludas.

Ps. 663: vide ne in quaestione sis.

Ps. 942: At vide ne titubes.

Extensions within the Present.

Miles, 983: sed ne amittam et mutet

Vide modo.

Extensions in Tense.

Perfect.

Ps. 1096: vide mode ne illic sit contechnatus quippiam.

Most. 966: Vide ne devorteris atque biberis.

8. WITH OPERAM DO (ADDO), ETC.

A. Subjunctive alone.

No instances occur.

B. Subjunctive with Ut.

ORIGINAL USES.

Capt. 434: Neque des operam ut facias.

DERIVED USES.

Extensions within the Present.

Poen. 1015: orat operam ut des ut veneant.

Poen. 1204: addunt operam ut placeant.

Pers. 629: ut optata eveniant operam addito.

Cas. 16: Verum ut cognoscant dabimus operam.

Bacch. 103: operam dabo Ut accipias potius quam eas.

Trin. 860: Dabo operam ut sentiat.

Following the analogy of verbs of effort we find *diligens* combined once with an *ut*-clause:

Amph. 630: memor sum et diligens ut compareant.

Extensions in Tense.

Imperfect.

Curc. 346: mandavi ut daret Operam ut abduceret.

C. Subjunctive with *ne*.

ORIGINAL USES.

None occur.

DERIVED USES.

Extensions within the Present.

Truc. 15: dat operam . . . ne sit reliquom.

Pers. 372: ei rei operam do, ne dicant.

Cas. 772: ei rei dant operam, ne cenen senex.

Pseud. 1115: Ne metuam: ei rei operam dabo.

9. CONSTRUCTIONS WITH CAVE.

Constructions of the Cave Facias Type.

Two theories which have been advanced concerning the origin of this idiom are entitled to consideration:

(1) The first of these holds that *cave facias* develops from *facias: cave* in the original force of 'do this (*i. e.*, if you do this); beware,' *i. e.*, 'beware lest you do this.'¹ This use of the jussive as a protasis is of course fairly frequent at all periods of the language, and the theory here advanced for the origin of the dependent clause with *cave* seems to receive support from such expressions as *Rud.* 1007; 1010.

¹ This theory was advanced by Bennett, *Lat. Gram.*, § 305, 2.

This theory of course assumes that the original order was *facias : cave*, as seen in Ter. *Andria*, 753 : *faxis, cave*, and that after the original protatice jussive came to be felt as dependent and as the object of *cave*, the original order was inverted : cf. the regular order with verbs of fearing (*metuo ne veniat*, originally *ne veniat : metuo*), and in fact the order with most verbs taking a substantive clause of jussive or of optative origin.

(2) The second theory is one which is advanced by Morris, *Am. Jour. Phil.*, vol. xviii, p. 379, viz., that in *cave faxis* we have an analogical phenomenon; i. e., it is impossible for *cave faxis* to represent an original *faxis*, 'do this': *cave*, 'beware' (that you don't), just as *nolo abeas* could not represent an original *abeas*: *nolo* (see p. 25); and Morris therefore holds that the *cave* is used simply by analogy with some such expression as *fac*, *vide*, etc., that is to say, to put the development in the form of an equation, just as *volo abeas* gave rise to a *nolo abeas*, just so did *fac cures* give rise to *cave cures*.¹

A potential origin has sometimes been advocated for expressions of this type, a favorite example for illustration being *cave cadas*, which is explained as having originally meant 'beware: you may fall'. But this explanation of origin is impossible, since it involves a potential use unknown to Latin except in expressions of the *aliquis dicat*, *aliquis dixerit*, type.

Moreover even granting the correctness of this potential theory in such an expression as *cave cadas*, it would clearly fail to apply to the vast majority of instances of the general type; e. g., *cave responderis*; *cave supplicassis*; *cave objexis manum*; *cave istud dixis*, etc. The very great preponderance of instances where the assumption of this potential origin would be absolutely illogical,

¹Delbrück, in the last volume of Brugmann, *Grundriss der Vergl. Gramm.*, v. 3, p. 420, expresses practically the same view: "Ich glaube nicht, dass *cave faxis* ursprünglich hieß 'hüte dich, du könntest es thun' (denn dieser potentielle Gebrauch liegt doch eigentlich nur in der ersten Person vor, vgl. 2, 338), sondern nehme an, dass *cave* sich nach *fac* gerichtet hat. Wie dasjenige was bewirkt werden soll, von *fac* abhängig erscheint, so denn von *cave* dasjenige wovor man sich hüten soll."

even should we concede its possibility in certain instances, constitutes an additional argument, if any were necessary, against the theory.

A. Cave with Simple Subjunctive.

ORIGINAL USES.

Cas. 530: Sed tu cave in quaestione mihi sis.

Capt. 439^b: cave fidem fluxam geras.

Most. 1025: Tu cave quadraginta accepisse hinc te neges.

Pers. 51: cave fuas mihi in quaestione.

Poen. 117: Cave dirumpatis.

Most. 810: Ah, cave tu illi objectes Te has emisse.

Epid. 437: Cave praeterbitas ulla aedis.

Capt. 431: Cave tu mi iratus fuas.

Rud. 704: cave tu harum conchas spernas.

Bacch. 1033: Cave tibi ducenti nummi dividiae fuant.

Cure. 461: Leno, cave in te sit mora mihi.

Amph. 608: Cave quicquam, mihi responderis.

As. 256: cave tu idem faxis.

As. 467: verbo cave supplicassis.

As. 625: Verbum cave faxis, verbero.

Aul. 90: Cave quemquam alienum in aedis intromiseris.

Aul. 608: Tu modo cave quoiquam indicassis.

Aul. 618: Cave tu illi fidelis, fueris.

Bacch. 910: Cave parsis in eum dicere.

Bacch. 1118: quod di dant boni cave culpa tua amissis.

Bacch. 402: Cave sis te superare servom siris.

Cas. 332: istos minutos cave deos flocci feceris.

Cas. 404: Cave objexis manum.

Cave here is Bothie's conjecture for *ne* of the MSS.

Cis. 300: Cave tu unquam bellum sumpseris.

Epid. 400: Cave siris cum filia Mea copulari.

Epid. 439: cave ad me rettuleris pedem.

Men. 994: Cave quisquam vostrum flocci fecerit.

Merc. 113: cave pigritiae praevorteris.

Merc. 484: cave tu istuc deixis.

Miles. 1368: Cave istuc feceris.

- Miles*, 1125 : Istuc cave faxis.
Miles, 1372 : cave faxis.
Miles, 1245 : cave sis faxis.
Most. 523 : Cave respexis.
Most. 808 : Cave tu ullam flocci faxis.
Most. 401 : Cave siveris.
Pers. 816 : Cave sis me attigas.
Pers. 389 : Cave sis tu istuc dixeris.
Poen. 1023 : Hem, cave sis feceris.
St. 285 : cave quemquam flocci feceris.
Trin. 555 : Cave sis dixeris.
Trin. 513 : cave sis feceris.
Vid. 83 : Cave tu istuc dixis.
Vid. 91 : Cave demutassis.
Truc. 943 : Cave faxis.

DERIVED USES.

Extensions within the Present. •

- St.* 37 : cave sis andiam ego istuc posthac.
Aul. 660 : cave sis te videam.
Cas. 903 : Cavebunt qui audierint faciant.

Extension in Tense.

Imperfect.

- Men.* 785 : edixi tibi Ut caveres nenter ad me iretis.

B. *Caveo ne.*

ORIGINAL USES.

- Most.* 324 : Cave ne cadas.
Most. 326 : Cave modo ne prius in via accubas.
Amph. 845 : cave sis ne tu te usū perdis.
Aul. 584 : cave Ne tu immutassis nomen.
As. 372 : caveto ne sūscenseas.
As. 373 : Hercle vero tu cavebis ne me attingas.
Ps. 127 : a me ut caveant ne credant mihi.
St. 121 : Caveat ne faciat quod pigeat postridie.

Apparently the only original uses of the *caveo ne* type are those

in which we have *cave ne*¹. *Cave ue cadas, cave ne facias* would seem to represent the original type, which forms the model for all the following derived uses. On no other basis, I believe, is it possible to explain the origin of the *ne*-clause, as will, I think, be apparent from an examination of the material submitted.

DERIVED USES.

Extensions within the Present.

Rud. 1246: *cavere aequissimumst Ne concii sint.*

Capt. 255: *Qui cavet ne decipiatur.*

Truc. 37: *ne effugiat cavet.*

Bacch. 544: *Sibi ne invideatur ipsi ignavi recte carent.*

Aul. 101: *ne intrömittatur cavet.*

Ps. 478: *ego nequid noceat cavero.*

Trin. 1011: *Cave ne cottabi crebri crepent.*

Ps. 1296: *cave ne cadam.*

Men. 270: *cavero Ne tu delinques neve ego irascar.*

Most. 924: *ausim non cavere ne quid committam tibi?*

Extensions in Tense.

Imperfect.

Rud. 378: *Cavistis ergo tu atque erus ne abiret.*

Amph. 944: *Primum cavisse oportuit ne dices.*

Merc. 189: *quin cavisti ne eam videret?*

Ps. 897: *cavereim Ne fidem ei haberem.*

Merc. 958: *cavi nequid facereim.*

Passive Extension.

Bacch. 418: *Dum caveatur nequid delinquit.*

Capt. 253: *ne in quaestione essemus cautum intellego.*

Merc. 466: *ne hic resciscat cauto opust.*

¹ Rarely the 3d person occurs, *e. g.*, *Ps.* 127: *a me ut caveant ne credant mihi.*

Most. 902 : magis cautost opus Ne luc exeat.

Cis. 531^b : amens nequid faciat cauto opust.

Merc. 333 : praecaustost opus, Ne hic sentiat.

Under "Derived Uses" must also be reckoned the following instances of *cautio est* and the adjective *cautior*:

a) *cautio est*.

Ps. 170 : ne quispiam pertundat cruminam cautiost.

Poen. 445 : mihi cautiost Ne objexim moram.

Bacch. 597 : cautiost Ne nucifrangibula excussit ex malis meis.

b) *cautior*.

Ps. 298 : cautiores sunt ne credant alteri.

Origin of Constructions of the *Cave Ne Facias* Type.

Expressions of this type seem to go back immediately to an ordinary jussive (prohibitive) use, *i. e.*, *cave ne facias* meant originally 'beware: don't do this,' in which the *ne*-clause naturally came at once to be felt as object of *cave*, and so paved the way for the wide extension of the *ne*-clause in various directions.

As to difference of meaning between expressions of the type *cave facias* and those of the type *cave ne facias*, the former, in Plautus at least, seem more peremptory, while the latter are rather suggestive of a genuine solicitude on the speaker's part; yet, as will be seen from the examples (only six of the *cave ne* type), the material is scanty, and for the later Latinity it is doubtful whether the distinction made for Plautus holds. Certainly in many instances it will not.

C. *Cavere ut.*

Bacch. 42 : qui caveat . . . ut . . . se revelhat domum.

Bacch. 44 : (cave) ut revelhatur domum.

Capt. 224 : cauto opus est ut sobrie hoc agatur.

All these are Derived Uses.

10. WITH VERBS OF PERMITTING, GRANTING, ALLOWING.

A. Subjunctive alone.

ORIGINAL USES.

1. The Subjunctive precedes.

a) *licet.*

Epid. 471 : Habeas licet.

The substantive clause with *licet* seems to have developed from that special type of the jussive which we designate as ‘permissive’, and which occurs freely in independent sentences in Plautus and other writers. Thus *habeas* or *tibi habeas* is frequently found in the sense of ‘have it, (if you want it’), i. e., ‘you may have it.’

Capt. 303 : laedat licet.

Most. 713 : incusses licet.

Trin. 1179 : Et tute item videas licet.

Merc. 989 : habeat licet.

Rud. 139 : sis licet.

b) *sino.*

Miles, 1244 : Sine veniat, quaeritet, desideret, expectet.

Bacch. 1134 : sic sine astent.

Cas. 206 : sine quod libet id faciat.

Cas. 206 : Sine amet.

Cis. 734 : Sine dicat.

As. 460 : sic sine astet.

Ps. 159 : Sine siet.

Ps. 477 : Jam sic sine Iratus sit.

Cas. 437 : Sine modo rus veniat.

Most. 11 : sine modo adveniat senex.

Epid. 36 : Tum ille prognatus Theti Sine perdat.

DERIVED USES.

Extensions within the Present.

a) *sino.*

Poen. 375 : Sine te exorem, sine prehendam auriculis, Sine dem savium.

- Cis.* 454 : Sine dicam.
Pers. 750 : Sine dicam.
Miles, 1084 : Sinite abeam.
Bacch. 24 (xiv) : Sine te amem.
Bacch. 1199 : sine te exorem.
Most. 1180 : Sine te exorem.
Bacch. 1176 : Sine te exorem.
Ps. 239^a : Sine sim nili.
Ps. 239^b : Sine abeam.
Epid. 204 : sine respirem.
Bacch. 1027 : Sine perlegam.
Cas. 136 : sine tuos oculos deosculer.
Poen. 142 : Sine te verberem.
Poen. 261 : Sine amem.
 b) *licet*.
As. 718 : Licet laudem Fortunam.
 c) *concedo, do*.
Amph. Prol. 11 : concessum et datum nuntiis praesim.

Extensions in Tense.

Imperfect.

Miles, 54 : sivi viverent.

B. Subjunctive with *ut*.

ORIGINAL USES.

Amph. 546 : mitto uti cedas.
As. 43 : Dono ut expers sis.

DERIVED USES.

Extensions within the Present.

Epid. 148 : nunc patierin ut ego me interimam ?

After the analogy of verbs of *permitting*, nouns of permission, opportunity, etc., are freely construed with a subjunctive clause.

Miles, 769 : hanc ecficiamus copiam, Ut abducat abeatque.

Capt. 373: copiam istam mi et potestatem facis Ut remittam.

Pers. 255: hanc commoditatis copiam Danunt ut adferam.

Miles, 977: Hercle occasionem lepidam ut excludam.

Capt. 934: di eam potestatem dabunt, Ut muneres.

Rud. 927: occasio optigit ut liber sit nemo. *liber sit* is Leo's conjecture for *liberes* of the MSS.

Pers. 671: quaerere ansam infectum ut faciat.

Amph. 646: id si mercedis Datur ut clueat.

Extensions in Tense.

Imperfect.

These occur only with the nouns *copia*, *potestas*, and *occasio*.

Ps. 285: Fuit occasio, ut daret.

Bacch. 673: occasio fuit ut sunieres.

Bacch. 422: hoc fuisse copiae, ut efferres.

As. 847: potestatem dedi, ut esses.

Negative Extensions (see p. 12.)

a) *committo*.

Aul. 450: Neque committam ut siet.

Bacch. 1037: Neque haud committam ut dicas.

St. 640: Neque committam ut dicant.

b) *With nouns (copia, occasio)*.

Merc. 990: quoniam ut aliter facias non est copiae.

As is regularly the case, the negative points to an analogical extension from the developed positive type, *i. e.*, *copia est ut facias* gives rise to *non est copia ut facias*.

Epid. 645: Non habeo ullam occasionem ut fabuler.

C. Subjunctive with ne.

Amph. 924: da mihi hanc veniam ne mihi iratus sies. An original use.

**II. WITH VERBS OF DECIDING, RESOLVING,
etc.****A. Subjunctive alone.**

DERIVED USES.

Amph. 635 : ita divis placitum . . . plus mali . . . adsit.

B. Subjunctive with ut.

ORIGINAL USES.

Miles, 295 : Nam tibi jam ut pereas paratumst dupliciter.

Miles, 727 : statuit . . . ut veneat . . . pauperet.

DERIVED USES.

Extensions within the Present.

Amph. 635 : Ita divis est placitum, voluptatem ut maeror comes consequatur.

The three following cases are all with nouns that take the subjunctive after analogy of verbs of similar meaning.

Circ. 216 : ita sentio sententiam, Ut qui me nili faciat nec salvom velit.

Capt. 241 : di immortales animum ostenderunt Ut qui . . . conservum velint.

Cas. 300 : (Sors obtinget) ut quidem pol pereas.

Sors here is equivalent to 'the decree of fate,' 'doom.'

C. Subjunctive with ne.

DERIVED USES.

Circ. 704 : Dum quidem . . . judices, ne quisquam a me argentum auferat. A Present Extension.

Mil. 725 : aequum fuit deos paravisse uno exemplo ne omnes vitam viverent. A Past Extension.

12. 'STIPULATIVE' SUBSTANTIVE CLAUSES.

For a discussion of clauses belonging to this category, see Bennett, *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, vol. 31. The term is a new one, but it has excellent *raison d'être*, as will be shown by the following examples of its occurrence in Plautus.

A. Subjunctive alone.

ORIGINAL USES.

Aul. 155: *his legibus . . . ducam, Quae cras veniat, perendie foras feratur,* 'I'll marry on these terms, let her come to-morrow, and die the day after.'

Persa. 70: *atque in ea lege . . . Ubi quadruplator quempiam injexit manum, Tantidem ille illi iniciat manum.*

Ps. 236: *Quonam pacto possim vincere animum?* PS. In rem quod sit praevortaris, *i. e.*, by anticipating what is helpful.

DERIVED USES.

Extensions in Tense.

Imperfect.

Merc. 536: *inter nos conjuravimus . . . Neuter stupri causa caput limaret.*

This is a projection into the past of 'we agree on oath ; let neither one take,' *etc.*

Epid. 315: *conducere aliquam fidicinam . . . dum rem divinam, cantaret sibi.* This is the reading of the MSS. and should, I believe, be retained. *B¹* has *dinam*; hence, Bücheler conjectured *quae* (before *dum*), while Götz and Schöll, following *Epid.* 500, read *ut dum*.

B. Subjunctive with *ut*.

ORIGINAL USES.

Here we find the stipulative clause not only with verbs, but more commonly in combination with nouns derived from verbs that take the construction, especially with *lex*, *condicio*, *etc.*

a) *lex.*

As. 234: Dabo perpetuom annum hunc mihi uti serviat
Nec quemquam interea alium admittat.

This example is interesting since it not only exhibits a stipulative construction, but also throws light on the question of negatives with the volitive subjunctive in sequence after a preceding subjunctive. 'She is to be my mistress, and is not to have any other lover.' 'And not' is here, as repeatedly elsewhere in constructions of a volitive nature, expressed by *nec* and not by *neve*.

Most. 359: Sed ea lege ut offigantur bis pedes.

b) *condicio.*

Bacch. 1041: Duae condiciones sunt Vel ut aurum
perdas vel ut amator perierit.

Rud. 1030: TR. Ecquid condicionis audes ferre? GR. Jam
dudum fero: ut abeas, rudentem amittas.

c) *modo.*

Poen. 853: do tibi operam hanc. MI. Quo modo? SY. Ut
. . . . tu corium sufferas.

Amph. 1023: Quo modo? ME. Eo modo ut profecto vivas
. . . . miser.

d) *pacto.*

Bacch. 1178: At scin quo pacto me abducas? SO.
Mecum ut sis.

'But do you know on what condition (with what understanding)
you are taking me in doors'? 'That you are to be with me.'

Cas. 512: alio pacto condiam: . . . ut . . . sit . . . paratum
quod paratum non erat.

e) *quid dotis.*

Circ. 663: TH. Quid dotis? CV. Egone? ut semper me alat.

The point here is the intentional misapplication of the word *dos*. 'The marriage portion that I give is that he's to give me my daily portion as long as he lives.'

f) *rabo.*

Truc. 687: Rabonem habeto ut mecum hanc noctem sies.

g) in answer to quem ad modum.

Pers. 35 : SA. *Quem ad modum?* TO. *Ut mihi des numeros sescentos.*

Miles, 186 : PE. *Quem ad modum?* PA. *Ut eum verbis vincat.*

h) loco.

Curec. 563 : *verum locata res est—ut male sit tibi.*

Here the speaker evidently had started to say ‘I have agreed to dine elsewhere’, but by a bold *παρὰ προσδοκίαν* turns the sentence as we have it in the text, ‘I have arranged to—give you the mischief.’ This use of *loco*, it must be admitted, occurs nowhere else, but its boldness here seems justified by the *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*.

DERIVED USES.

Extensions within the Present.

a) convenit.

Capt. 378 : *Nunc ita convenit Ut te mittam ad patrem, Si non rebitas, huic ut viginti minas Dem.*

‘Now this, Tyndarus, is the agreement that I have made with this man : I am to send you to my father . . . and if you don’t come back, I’m to pay him twenty minae for you.’

Mittam and *dem* being in the first person are of course extensions from the second person.

Capt. 395 : *Dicito patri quo pacto convenerit . . . Ut eum redimatur et remittatur.*

‘Tell Father what agreement I made with this man. He is to,’ etc.

b) conduco.

Epid. 500 : *Conducta veni ut fidibus cantarem sibi ; cf. above (p. 64), Epid. 315.*

c) signum, ‘countersign’ (i. e., token of agreement).

Bacch. 329 : *id signum est cum Theotimo, aurum ut reddat.*

d) nil est (sc. integumenti).

Most. 992 : *Mili nisi ut erum metuam et curem, nil est qui tergium tegam. I. e., nihil mihi est integumenti nisi ut metuam et curem,* ‘I have no protection except the protection of fearing’,

etc.; see Sonnenschein *ad loc.* Cf. Tac. *Dial.* 33,5: *nec quisquam percipere tot reconditas aut tam varias res potest, nisi ut scientiae meditatio, meditationi facultas, facultati vis eloquentiae accedat;* Quint. V. 10, 57; Plin. *Epf.* ii, 11, 16; in all of which passages we evidently have the same idiom as in the *Mostellaria* example.

Extensions in Tense.

Imperfect.

a) *convenit.*

Amph. 225: *Convenit . . . Urbein, agrum, aras, focos, sequenti dederent.*

The terms of the agreement were that 'each party was to surrender' etc. (*convenit uti dedant*). Cf. Livy i, 24, 3: *Priusquam dimicarent, foedus ictum inter Romanos et Albanos est his legibus, ut, cuius populi cives eo certamine vicissent, is alteri populo cum bona pace imperitaret.*

b) *legibus pactis.*

As. 735: *pactis legibus dare jussit. . . . Noctem . . . ut dares.*

Ut dares is a projection into the past of *ut des.*

C. Subjunctive with *ne*.

ORIGINAL USES.

Rud. 1031: *Ecquid condicionis audes ferre? GR. Jam dudum fero . . . mihi molestus ne sies.*

DERIVED USES.

Extensions within the Present.

Aul. 434: *me haud paenitet tua ne expetam, i. e., 'I'm satisfied with the understanding that I'm not to seek your property', 'the agreement not to seek your property satisfies me'.*

D. Subjunctive with *ut ne*.

Truc. 918: *PHR. Quem ego ecastor image aino quam te? STR. Quam me? quo modo? PHR. Hoc modo ut molestus ne sis.*

Aul. 251-258: *Couvenisse ut nequid dotis mea ad te afferret filia.*

This is a projection into the past of *convenit ut nequid dotis mea ad te afferat filia.*

Cas. 512 : alio pacto condiam quod id quod paratumst, ut paratum ne siet.

E. Subjunctive with *ni*.

da pignus ni, etc.

For a full discussion of this construction as presenting a type of the substantive stipulative clause, see Bennett, *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, Vol. xxxi (1900).

Epid. 699 : *da pignus ni ea sit filia.*

The Götz-Schöll edition reads *east*, i. e., *ea est*, entirely without MSS. authority, and apparently on the unnecessary conjecture of Oskar Brügmann. It is gratifying that Leo in his edition adheres to the MSS. evidence; so also do Ussing and Gray, *q. v. ad loc.*, but apparently without fully appreciating the nature of the construction, for they quote, without further comment, *Cas. 75, etc.*, where *da pignus* takes the indicative,—a construction without doubt based on an entirely different point of view, as far as concerns the *ni*-clause. (See below).

Truc. 275 : *Pignus da ni ligneae hae sint quas habes Victorias.*

I read in this passage, *sint* in accordance with *A* as opposed to *sunt* of *P*, accepted by Götz-Schöll and Leo, the latter of whom refers to Brügmann, *de ni condic.*, p. 12 f., and Lindskog, *de enunt. condic.*, p. 57. The *sint* is without doubt the *difficilior lectio*, and should, I believe, be retained in our texts of the passage, particularly as it has the authority of *A*.

Poen. 1242 : *Da pignus ni nunc perjeres in savium uter utri det.*

perjures is the reading of *AP*; *perjeres*, the reading of Götz-Schöll, Leo, and others, is the suggestion of Pylades. The long *u* would be metrically false here.

Rud. 1380 : *Cedo quicum habeam iudicem, Ni dolo malo instipulatus sis nive etiamdum siem Quinque et viginti annos natus.*

Götz-Schöll, following Priscian, read *sive*, Leo reads *nive* with the MSS.

Apparently the only explanation of sentences of the type *da pignus ni* with subjunctive is to regard them as involving 'stipu-

lative' substantive clauses. Other explanations have been offered, *e.g.*, that of Oskar Brugmann,¹ but we are hardly warranted with him in changing all subjunctives in the *ni*-clauses to indicatives (in the face of MSS. authority that varies from strong to overwhelming), simply to bring them within the possibility of a conditional interpretation. To be sure, the indicative clause with *ni*, *e.g.* in *Cas.* 75: *id ni fit pignus dato*, can hardly be anything else than a conditional clause, but I should maintain that the *ni*-subjunctive construction is in nature and origin entirely different. The existence of two forms of expression, widely divergent in origin but with practically the same logical equivalence, should not excite great wonder. Compare, *e.g.*, the use of *cave* with either the simple subjunctive or the subjunctive introduced by *ne*; see above, pp. 54, 59.

13. WITH POTIN, ETC.

A. With Subjunctive alone.

ORIGINAL USES.

The original meaning in expressions of the type *potin abeas*, *etc.*, seems to have been 'go away!: can't you?'.

Pers. 297: *potin abeas?*

Cas. 731: *?Ω Ζεῦ potin a med abeas?*

B. Subjunctive with *ut*.

Bacch. 751: *potin ut cures te.*

Men. 466: *Potine ut quiescas?*

Merc. 495: *Potin ut aliud cures?*

Merc. 890: *Potin ut animo sis tranquillo?*

Amph. 903: *Potin ut abstineas manum?*

Pers. 175: *Potin ut taceas?*

Most. 396: *Potin ut animo sis quieto et facias quod jubeo?*

Trin. 628: *Potin ut me ire quo profectus sum sinas?*

Poen. 916: *Potin ut taceas?*

¹ *Ueber den Gebrauch des condicionalen NI in der älteren Latinität.*
Leipzig, 1887.

Ps. 264: Potin ut semel huc respicias?

Ps. 393: Potin ut abeas?

Miles, 926: Potin ut hominem Mihi des, quiescas cetera?

Ps. 235: Potin aliam rem ut cures?

Ps. 940; 942: Potin ut taceas?

Rudens, 425: potin ut me abstineas manum?

Bacch. 35: potis est ut tu taceas?

Extension within the Present.

Bacch. 35: potis est ut ego loquar?

Ps. 633: potest ut alii ita arbitrentur. For the origin of this subjunctive, see below under **D**.

C. Subjunctive with ne.

ORIGINAL USES.

Pers. 175: potin ne moneas?

D. Subjunctive with ut ne.

ORIGINAL USES.

Bacch. 751: potin ut ne parcas mihi?

Epid. 63: Potin ut molestus ne sies?

Truc. 897: Potin ut mihi molestus ne sies?

Cis. 465: Potin ut mihi molestus ne sis?

Men. 627: Potin ut mihi molestus ne sis?

Pers. 287: Potin ut molestus ne sies?

Merc. 779: Potine ut molestus ne seis?

Merc. 441: Potine ut ne licitere advorsum mei animi sententiam?

Here also I should put:

Ps. 633: potest ego ut ne credam. This seems to me to have developed under the influence of the type just considered.

14. WITH OPTUMUM EST, TEMPUS EST, DECECT, AEQUOM EST, ETC.

A. Subjunctive alone.

ORIGINAL USES.

Merc. 497 : Meliust sanus sis.

I here read *meliust* following *A* as against *melius* (*P*). Ritschl, followed by Götz-Schiöll, inserts *si* before *sis*; Seyffert suggests *ut*, but I see no necessity of altering the text here, and think we should recognize *melius* followed by the simple subjunctive, as confidently as *optumum* with the simple subjunctive in the following example :

Aul. 567 : optumumist loces.

Poen. 21 : Diu qui domi otiosi dormierunt, decet Animo aequo nunc stent vel dormire temperent.

Most. 724 : sic decet morem geras.

DERIVED USES.

Extensions within the Present.

As. 448 : adeam optumumist.

Extensions in Tense.

Imperfect.

Mil. 730 : Itidem divos dispertisse vitam humanam aequoni fuit :
Qui lepide ingeniatus esset, vitam ei longinquam darent,
Qui improbi essent et scelesti, is adimerent animam cito.

Interrogative Extension (see p. 12).

Men. 947 : Scin quid facias optumumist ?

B. Subjunctive with *ut*.

ORIGINAL USES.

None occur.

DERIVED USES.

Extensions within the Present.

Miles, 1101 : Dicasque tempus maxime esse ut eat domum.

Originally : *ut eat domum*, 'just let her go home,' *tempus est*, 'it is time,' developing into *tempus est ut eat*, 'it is time for her to go.'

Trin. 485 : Semper tu hoc facito, Lesbonice, cogites,

Id optimum esse tute uti sis optimus :

Si id nequeas, saltem ut optimis sis proximus.

Miles, 72 : Videtur tempus esse ut eamus ad forum.

It is, perhaps, more natural to explain this as an extension to the first person. It is, however, perfectly possible to treat it as an original type, *i. e.*, developed from the Hortatory Subjunctive, *ut eamus*, 'just let us go'; *tempus est*, 'it's time' (for us to go).

Rud. 1230 : Aequom videtur tibi ut dicam.

Aul. 583 : hoc mihi factus optimum, ut te auferam.

Ps. 185 : hoc factus optimum, ut appellem.

The noun officium also occurs in this construction, following the analogy of verbs of related meaning.

Pers. 616 : scio ego officium ut eloquar.

Ps. 336 : Ex tua rest ut ego emoriar.

Ps. 336 : Ex tua re non est ut ego emoriar.

Aul. 154 : In rem hoc tuamist. MEG. Ut quidem emoriar prius quam ducam.

Extensions in Tense.

Imperfect.

Ps. 913 : Fuit meum officium ut facerem.

Trin. 119 : Ei rei operam dare te fuerat aliquanto aequius non ut Tu eandem tute accederes infamiam Malumque ut misceres.

Interrogative Extension.

Most. 27 : Hocinè boni esse officium servi existumas, Ut eri sui corrumpat et rem et filium?

C. Subjunctive with ne.

ORIGINAL USES.

Cis. 760 : Aequomist Ne sit malo benignitas.

Despite the missing word of v. 760, the sense of this passage seems perfectly clear. Yet it is possible that the clause may be one of purpose, and that *reponi* (Leo's conjecture) or some such word is to be supplied.

DERIVED USES.

Extension within the Present.

Aul. 587 : servi facinus frugi Ne morae molestiaeque imperium erile habeat.

15. OPUS EST, USUS EST, NECESSE EST, ETC.**A. Subjunctive alone.**

ORIGINAL USES.

None occur.

DERIVED USES.

Extension within the Present.

Poen. 1244 : pro hoc mihi patronus sim necessest.

Negative Extension.

Merc. 1004 : Nil opust resciscat.

This can be nothing but an analogical extension of an *opust resciscat* (*i. e.*, 'let him learn; he must'), and could have arisen only after *resciscat* in *opust resciscat* had come to be felt as thoroughly hypotactic; cf. the similar extension of *volo abeas* to *nolo abeas* (p. 25).

B. Subjunctive with ut.

ORIGINAL USES.

Poen. 1421 : Dum auctionem facio, hic opus est aliquot ut maneat dies.

Truc. 500 : nunc tibi opust aegram ut te adsimiles.

Miles, 1132 : *Nunc ad me ut veniat usust.*

Epid. 166 : *usust ut pudeat.*

DERIVED USES.

Extensions within the Present.

Truc. 328 : *Opus est ut lavem.*

Ut is the necessary conjecture of Caimerarius.

Ps. 740 : *Quid, si opus sit ut dulce promat indidem, ecquid habet?*

16. WITH PROHIBEO, ABSTERREO, ETC.

A. Subjunctive alone.

DERIVED USE.

Ps. 207 : [simul prohibet faciant adversum eos quod nolint].

If genuine, *faciant* here can only be explained as following the analogy of *subigo*, the opposite of *prohibeo*; cf. above on *nolo ores*, etc. (p. 25).

B. Subjunctive with ne.

ORIGINAL USES.

None occur.

DERIVED USES.

Extensions within the Present.

Poen. 399 : *Amabo, men prohibere postulas Ne te verberet magis quam ne mendax me advorsum siet?*

Men. 794 : *prohibere ad cenam ne promittat postules Neve quemquam . . . accipiat apud se.*

Trin. 87 : *Qui tu id prohibere me potes ne suspicer?*

Truc. 929 : *Auro, haud ferro, deterrere potest ne amet.*

Most. 539 : *Nisi quid occurro ne hoc senex resciscat, ‘unless I am beforehand with some move to prevent’ (Sonnenschein).*

Extension in Tense.

Imperfect.

Most. 420: *Jussit orare ut patrem absterrees Ne intro iret.*

Examples like this and *Most.* 539 (see above) suggest that the *ne*-clause after verbs of this category may in origin have been a purpose clause. Such an explanation seems much more natural than that the development was immediately from the jussive. I am at a loss to conceive of an original jussive parataxis with *prohibeo*, *absterreo*, etc., that would have developed the usage under consideration.

C. Subjunctive with *ut ne*.

Trin. 104: *est mihi in manu merito ut ne dicant.* A derived use; the *ut ne*-clause (like the *quin*-clause of this passage, see below chapter iii), depends upon the notion of preventing implied in the context.

17. WITH VERBS OF DESERVING, ETC.

A. Subjunctive alone.

No instances occur.

B. Subjunctive with *ut*.

ORIGINAL USES.

Apparently no genuine instance is preserved of an original use of the substantive clause with *mereo* and kindred verbs, but the jussive origin seems well established by the occurrence of the negative *ne* (*e.g.*, *Men.* 1100: *promeruisti ut nequid ores*; *Vell. Paterc.* ii, 12, 5: *hac victoria videtur meruisse Marius ne ejus natrem publicam pacniteret etc.*) Probably an original use would be something like *meruisti*: *ut hanc coronam accipias*, *i.e.*, 'just take this crown; you've earned it.' From such beginnings the following extensions enumerated below would easily develop.

DERIVED USES.

Extensions within the Present.

Epid. 442: promerui ut mihi Omnis mortalis agere deceat gratias.

Capt. 422: Pol istic me haud centesimam partem laudat quam ipse meritus ut laudetur laudibus.

Capt. 744: aliter ut dicam meres.

Men. 359: meret potissimum nostrae domi ut sit.

Epid. 721: meruisse intellego Ut liceat facere.

Poen. 1407: ego te meruisse ut pereas scio.

Pers. 496: Tuomi promeritumst merito ut faciam.

Here we have a noun following the analogy of verbs of *deserving*.

Negative Extensions.

Miles, 1140: non sum dignus ut figam palum in parietem.

Aul. 222: neque verbis merui ut faceres quodfacis.

Men. 1067: Non promeruisti de me ut pigeat.

C. Subjunctive with *ut ne*.

ORIGINAL USES.

None occur.

DERIVED USES.

Extension in Person.

Men. 1100: Promeruisti ut nequid ores quin impetres.

18. CAUSA EST UT.

Here belongs *Capt.* 257: non justa causa est ut vos servem?

This I should regard as a negative interrogative extension (accompanied by change of person) of the following, which may be presumed to have represented the original type: *causa est: ut serves*, 'just watch; there's reason (for it).'

19. EXPRESSIONS OF EXEMPTING AND REFRAINING.

Here belong :

Trin. 293 : Hisce ego de artibus gratiam facio, Ne colas neve inbuas ingenium.

I. e., ‘as regards these ways, I exempt you; don’t practice them or stain your character with them.’ (= ‘I exempt you from.’)

Miles, 576 : Quam benigne gratiam fecit ne iratus esset.

Of these two uses, the former is original, the latter is a past extension.

Trin. 316 : ne . . . parerem parsi. A past extension.

St. 117 : Ne id faciat temperat. A present extension.

20. SUBSTANTIVE CLAUSES OF PROVISO.

This category is represented by but two examples :

As. 166 : Semper tibi promissum habeto hac lege, dum superes datis.

The second is used after the noun *spectamen*, ‘test’, ‘proof’.

Men. 966 : Spectamen bono servo id est . . . ut rem eri . . . tutetur, *i. e.*, ‘he is good, provided he protects.’

21. WITH QUID EST QUOD; NIHIL EST QUOD; ETC.

Here belong expressions of the type: *quid est quod metuas*, ‘what reason is there that you should fear’; *nil est quod metuas*, ‘there’s no reason why you should fear.’ My own view is that these expressions are a development of relative clauses of purpose, and in view of the fact that the purpose clause is itself a development from the jussive, I put these clauses in the jussive chapter. In accordance with this theory of a purpose origin, then, *quid est quod metuas* originally meant ‘what is there for you to fear?’ whence naturally, ‘what reason is there for you to fear’;

'why is it that you fear?' To the Roman mind, *quod*, apparently, came to be felt as an interrogative conjunction. This paved the way for expressions of the type : *quid est quod abeas*, where *quod* obviously could not have been a pronoun and the dependent clause could never have been one of purpose. These last are therefore secondary in origin and an extension of the original purpose type. That such clauses were distinctly felt as causal, seems clear, not merely in view of the context in which they occur, but also from the answers given in *Amph.* 504 : *edepol haud quod distaedeat*; *Ps.* 1088 : *quia numquam abducet mulierem*.

ORIGINAL USES.

a) *quid est quod*.

No instances occur.

b) *nihil est quod*.

Amph. 1133 : *nil est quod timeas*.

Ps. 1066 : *Nil est quod metuas*.

Trin. 808 : *Nil est de signo quod vereare*.

Most. 712 : *Nihil erit quod accusites*.

DERIVED USES.

a) *quid est quod*.

Capt. 541 : *Quid istuc est quod meos te dicam fugitare oculos?*

Amph. 503 : *Quid istuc est quod Abeas?*

IV. *Edepol haud quod distaedeat*.

Rud. 638 : *dicas negoti quid sit quod tumultus*.

Curc. 166 : *quid est quod Palinurum voces?*

Ps. 1088 : *Quid est quod non metuas*.

b) *nihil est quod*.

Merc. 317 : *nil est jam quod tu mihi suscenseas*.

c) *est quod*.

Trin. 310 : *est quod gaudeas*.

Merc. 502 : *tibi quidem quod rideas est*.

Trin. 1166 : *est quod mihi suscenseas*.

Rud. 516 : *bonam est quod habeas gratiam*.

d) *nil scio quod*.

Capt. 842 : *nil scio quod gaudeam*.

Under the same influence I conceive the following to have developed :

Aul. 92 : ne causae quid sit quod te quisquam quaeritet.

22. SUBSTANTIVE CLAUSES OF PURPOSE.

Trin. 1188 : paratus sis ut ducas.

Ps. 486 : paritas ut auferas.

Aul. 827 : Jam nt eriperes apparabas.

Rud. 717 : Non hodie isti rei auspicavi ut fabuler.

Trin. 652 : Atque ego istum agrum tibi relinqu ob eam rem enixe expeto, Ut tibi sit qui te corrigere possis.

Ps. 795 : Quin ob eam rem Orcus recipere ad se hunc noluit, Ut esset hic qui mortuis cenam coquat.

Cas. 1005 : Propter eam rem hanc tibi nunc veniam minus gravate prospero, Hanc ex longa longiorem ne faciamus fabulam.

Epid. 276 : Quam ad rem istuc refert? Ut enim praestines argento ut dicas ut amoveas.

Truc. 395 : Quoi rei te adsimulare retulit? PHR. Ut esset aliquis laqueus et redimiculum Revorsionem ut ad me faceret denuio.

Aul. 32 : id ea faciam gratia, Quo ille eam facilius ducat qui compresserat.

Merc. 223 : Quin ea ego huic praecucurri gratia, Ne te opprimeret imprudentem atque electaret.

Cas. 531 : Hoc erat ecastor quod me vir tanto opere orabat meus, Ut properarem ut essent.

Poen. 294 : Quid eo opust? MI. Ego dicam : ut illi et tibi limem caput.

Aul. 575 : Ut me deponat vino, eam adfectat viam : Post hoc quod habeo ut committet coloniani.

Miles, 205 : quod agat aegre suppetit; *i. e.*, 'a course of action suggests itself with difficulty'.

Miles, 1080 : Eo minus dixi ne haec censueret me aduersum se mentiri.

Miles, 790 : Sed quid ea usus est? PA. Ut ad te eam jam deducas domum Itaque adducas. *I. e.*, 'for this purpose, *viz.*, that you may.'

Miles, 1420: Quam ob rem? CA. . . . Ut ted amittamus.

Pers. 136: Immo alium adlegavero Qui vendat: qui esse se peregrinum praedicet. *I. e.*, ‘I shall send him with instructions to.’ In this and the two following examples, a *relative* clause of purpose has developed a substantive function.

Aul. 464: Is ea causa misit hoc qui subriperent misero mihi.

Miles, 745: Servienda servituti ego servos instruxi mihi, Hospes, non qui mihi imperarent quibusve ego essem obnoxius.

This is equivalent to *servire ego servos docui non mihi imperare*, *i. e.*, the relative clause stands virtually in relation of internal object to *instruxi*, though Krebs-Schmalz, *Antibarbarus*⁶, state that *instruere* is not found with this construction.

Amph. 84: Quive alter quo placeret fecisset minus.

This is the only use of *quo minus* in a substantive clause in Plautus.

All the above examples obviously represent derived uses.

23. CLAUSES INTRODUCED BY QUAM.

By origin these clauses go back to various types already treated above, but for the sake of convenience all the *quam*-clauses are here brought together.

A. With Simple Subjunctive.

ORIGINAL USES.

Ps. 236: Fac possis. CA. Quonam pacto possim vincere animum? PS. In rem quod sit praevortaris quam . . . animo auscules. (See above, p. 64).

DERIVED USES.

Extensions in Person.

Rud. 328: quid mihi meliust quam ilico hic opperiar erum?

Men. 832: Quid mihi meliust quam Ego med adsimulem insaniire?

Most. 1170: Aliud quidvis impetrari a me facilius perferam
Quam ut non ego istum pessum premam.

Poen. 1150: Facias modo quam memores mavelim.

Ps. 209: At taceas malo multo quam tacere dicas.

Bacch. 103: operam dabo . . . ut accipias potius . . . quam . . . eas.

Cas. 252: Jam domuisti animum potius ut quod vir velit fieri id facias quam advorsere contra?

Aul. 154: In rem hoc tuamst. MEG. Ut quidem emoriar prius quam ducam.

Most. 706: Exsequi certa res est ut abeam Potius hinc ad forum quam domi cubem.

I. e., 'I'm determined on accomplishing my departure rather than taking a nap.' For the classification of the subjunctive see p. 48.

B. Subjunctive with *ut*.

ORIGINAL USES.

None occur.

DERIVED USES.

Ps. 1121: Nec quicquamst melius quam ut hoc pultem atque aliquem evocem hinc intus.

Aul. 76: neque quicquam meliust mihi . . . quam ex me ut unam faciam litteram longam.

Rud. 220: Quid mihi meliust, quid magis in remist, quam a corpore vitam ut secludam?

Rud. 1189: Quid meliust quam ut hinc intro abeam et me suspendam clanculum?

Trin. 762: Malim hercle ut verum dicas quam ut des minutum.

Merc. 502: Quin tibi quidem quod rideas magis est quam ut lamentere.

In this example the (*est*) *quod rideas* was a relative clause of purpose which secondarily developed a causal notion (see p. 77f). The *quam ut* clause seems to be present by virtue of the analogy of the preceding clause with something like *est causa cur, ut, etc.*,

i. e., the whole sentence would be the equivalent of *est causa ut lamentere*; *est quod rideas magis*, or, combining the two, *est quod rideas* [= *est causa ut*] *magis quam ut lamentere*.

C. Subjunctive with ne.

Poen. 399: Amabo, men prohibere postulas Ne te verberet magis quam ne mendax me advorsum siet? This is a derived use.

CHAPTER II.

SUBSTANTIVE CLAUSES DEVELOPED FROM THE SUBJUNCTIVE OF DETERMINED RESOLUTION.¹

This original use of the volitive subjunctive in independent sentences is rare, and yet it seems to be necessary to recognize it, although its existence is questioned by some. There is *a priori* no reason why such a function should not belong to the first person of the subjunctive mood in its volitive use. If *abeas*, *abeat* meant originally, 'You go away,' 'let him go away,' *abeam* should mean, 'I will (not 'shall') go away.' Thus Ter. *Heaut.* 273, *enarrem* should mean, 'I *will* finish telling,' 'I'm determined to finish telling.' The propriety of referring to this first person of Determined Resolution such substantive clauses as those that follow in this section has apparently not yet been suggested, and yet an interpretation on such a basis seems to be adequate and justifiable.

The material is as follows :

A. Subjunctive alone.

ORIGINAL USES.

1. Subjunctive precedes.

Poen. 501 : Profestos festos habeam, decretumst mihi.

That is, *Profestos festos habeam : hoc decrevi*, 'I'm bound to regard. . . . this is what I've determined upon.'

2. Subjunctive follows.

As. 248 : Certumst sumam faenore.

Amph. 1048 : Certumst intro rupipam in aedis.

Cas. 448 : Certumst hunc praemittam.

¹See Delbrück, *Conjunktiv und Optativ*, pp. 11 ff.; Riemaun, *Syntaxe Latine*², p. 260; Hale, *The Anticipatory Subjunctive*, p. 14; Delbrück, *Vgl. Syntax*, 2, p. 384.

Bacch. 382 : Certumst jam dicam patri.

Aul. 681 : Certumst malam rem potius quaeram cum lucro.

Capt. 778 : Nunc certa res est Coniciam in collum pallium.

In view of *Merc.* 472 : *certumst ibo atque dabo*, it is of course possible that *sumam*, *praemittam*, etc., in the above examples are future indicatives; yet in view of *Poen.* 501 (see above), it is equally possible that they are subjunctives. In consideration, however, of the evident meaning of all the passages, I am more disposed, with Morris, (*Am. Jour. Phil.* xviii, p. 145), to regard them as subjunctives.

B. Subjunctive with ut.

ORIGINAL USES.

None occur.

DERIVED USES.

Extension within the Present.

As. 505 : An ita tu's animata ut qui matris expers imperii sies?

Extensions in Tense.

Imperfect.

Ps. 549 : ut irem constitueram.

Aul. 383 : Accessit animus ad meam sententiam ut nuptum darem.

Aul. 371 : Volui animum confirmare ut bene haberem me filiai nuptiis.

Circ. 218 : sententiam ut qui me nili faciat nec salvom velit.

Amph. 762 : ita animatus fui Itaque nunc sum ut donem.

Subjunctive of Determined Resolution after Quam.

A single instance occurs :

Men. 1058 : Quin certissimumst Mepte potius fieri servom quam emittam.

CHAPTER III.

SUBSTANTIVE CLAUSES DEVELOPED FROM THE DELIBERATIVE SUBJUNCTIVE.

Under this head fall clauses introduced by *quin*, *cur*, and *quam ob rem*.

QUIN-CLAUSES.

Without doubt most *quin*-substantive clauses with the subjunctive are to be referred for their origin to an original parataxis in which the *quin*-clause was a Deliberative Subjunctive.¹ An original *quin ad diem decedam?* *Nulla causa est* would naturally develop into the *quin ad diem decedam nulla causa est* of Cic. *ad Fam.*, ii, 17, 1. Perhaps a more developed type is represented by Pl. *Pseud.* 533, *numquid causaest illico Quin te in pistrinum condam?*

The material in Plautus that falls under this head is as follows :

ORIGINAL USES.

a) *numquid causae, nulla causa, etc.*

Ps. 533 : *numquid causaest Quin te in pistrinum condam?*

Trin. 1188 : *Numquid causaest quin uxorem eras domum ducam?*

Amph. 852 : *Numquid causam dicis quin te hoc multem matrimonio.*

Aul. 261 : *sed nuptias Num quae causast quin faciamus hodie?*

Rud. 758 : *Quid causaest quin virgis te usque ad saturitatem sauciem?*

Aul. 755 : *hand causifor quin eam Ego habeam potissimum.*

Cas. 1003 : *Nulla causast quin verberes.*

Rud. 1070 : *nulla causast quin me condones cruci.*

¹See especially Kienitz, *de quin particulae apud priscos scriptores Latinos usu*, Karlsruhe, 1878.

Rud. 1397 : nulla causast quin feras.

Most. 434 : haū causast quin facias mihi.

Capt. 353 : Numquae causast quin viginti minas Mihi des?

Amph. Frag. xiii : Non causam dico quin vero insimules probri

Capt. 625 : nullam causam dico quin mihi Et parentum et libertatis apud te deliquio siet.

b) *numquid vis.*

Amph. 970 : Numquid vis quin abeam jam intro?

Cis. 117 : Numquid me vis, mater, intro quin eam?

c) *dubito.*

Poen. 183 : quid tu dubitas quin fur leuo siet?

Poen. 881 : Quid ergo dubitas quin faciat?

Aul. 164 : Quid dubitas quin sit paratum nomen puero.

d) *continere.*

Rud. 1172 : contineri quin complectar non queo.

Men. 1124 : contineri quin complectar non queo.

Men. 253 : Verum tamen nequeo contineri quin loquar.

e) *deterreo.*

Amph. 560 : quin loquar Numquam potes deterrire.

Miles, 332 : nemo deterrebit quin ea sit in his aedibus.

f) *prohibeo.*

Amph. 1051 : neque di omnes id prohibebunt Quin sic faciam.

Curc. 33 : Nemo hinc prohibet nec vetat Quin emas.

Merc. 1021 : Neu quisquam posthac prohibeto adulescentem filium Quin amet et scortum ducat.

g) *retineo, tenco.*

Trin. 641 : retineri nequeo quin dicam.

Cas. 239 : vix teneor quin quae decent te dicam.

h) *comprimo.*

Most. 203 : Vix comprimor quin involem illi.

i) *reproto.*

Miles, 1368 : Vix reprimor quin te manere jubeam.

Cas. 452 : vix reproto labra quin te deosculer.

j) *moro, remoror.*

Bacch. 340: numquam te morabitur Quin habeas illud.

Men. 1146: Numquid me morare quin ego liber siem?

As. 355: argentum non morabor quin feras.

Aul. 612: ne affinem morer Quin ducat domum.

I should include here the following passage: *Miles*, 920: Si non nos materiarini remoratur quod opus quin det; reading *quin* for the *qui* of the MSS. and editors. The passage does not yield satisfactory sense with *qui*, and paleographically a confusion between *qui* and *quin* is quite easy to assume.

k) *alieno.*

Amph. 399: me alienabis numquam quin noster siem.

l) *vinco.*

St. 756: Numquam vinces quin pruriam.

m) *depello.*

Trin. 639: Neque tuis depellar dictis quin rumori serviam.

n) *Verbs of 'inducing' in the pregnant sense of 'prevent by inducing'.*

Cas. 504: non conduci possum Quin compareni magnum malum Quinque faciam palam.

Men. 518: Numquam . . . exorabit quin . . . eloquar.

o) *non possum.*

Trin. 705: Non enim possum quin exclamem.

St. 302: Non enim possum quin revertar, quin loquar, quin edissertem

Eramque ex maerore eximam, bene facta majorum
meum

Exangeam atque illam augeam insperato opportuno
bono.

Pers. 612: Hui possum quin huic operam dem.

Bacch. 559: Vides non potesse quin eloquar.

Miles, 695: Tum plicatricem clementer non potest quin mu-
nerem.

Miles, 601 : Neque potest quin obsit tibi.

p) *est in manu* (= *possum*).

Trin. 105 : Quin dicant non est (*in manu*).

q) *nequeo*.

Miles, 1342 : nequeo quin fleam.

Truc. 553 : nequit quin nili sit atque improbis se artibus ex-poliat.

Pers. 824 : Nequeo, leno, quin tibi saltem staticulum.

r) *facio*.

Amph. 398 : numquam facies quin sim Sosia.

s) *recuso*.

Circ. 164 : haud recusem quin mili male sit, originally, perhaps, 'why shouldn't misfortune befall me'? 'I shouldn't be unwilling for it to.'

t) *patior*.

Men. 725 : non, inquam, patiar praeterhac, Quin vidua vivam.

On this passage Wagner says : "The words *non patiar quin* mean 'I shall not bear it any longer so as not to', *quin* being dependent on the verb with the negation, which is in its general sense equivalent to *nemo me impedire poterit quin (potius) vivam*, etc." But to me the foregoing material seems sufficiently to support the purely deliberative origin of the *quin*-clause in this passage.

u) *audeo*.

As. 25 : ut non audeam quin promiam omnia.

v) *With the noun negotium*.

Capt. 525 : neque negotiumst Quin male occidam oppetamque pestem.

Cf. Morris *ad loc* : "Nor is there any trouble about my dying ; anything to hinder me from dying. This sense of *negotium* is common."

Similarly, Elmer *ad loc* : "Quin follows the idea of prevention implied by *neque negotiumst*."

w) *aequom videtur.*

Trin. 587 : *Aequom videtur quin quod peccarim Potissimum mihi id opsit.*

The absence of the negative is certainly peculiar here, and the text is doubtless unsound. Yet the idea, ‘why shouldn’t I suffer the results of my error? ’tis only just,’ seems entirely natural.

x) *postulo.*

Vid. 88 : *Sed quin accedat faenus, id non postulo.*

It appears that Dinia has just lent a mina to Nicodemus, a young man in dire need of funds. Dinia says that he will charge no interest, *faenus mihi nullum duis.* The words above quoted are part of the reply of Nicodemus. We can conceive of this as pointing to an original *quin faenus accedat*, ‘why shouln’t interest be charged?’ ‘I don’t expect it (not to be).’

DERIVED USES.

Extensions in Tense.

Imperfect.

Circ. 227 : *non retineri potuit Quin reciperet se.*

Miles, 262 : *non potuit quin sermone suo aliquem Participaverit.*

Perfect.

Miles, 369 : *Numquam hercle deterrebor Quin viderim.*

Men. 190 : *ne quis quin ejus aliquid induitus sies.*

Amph. 1106 : *Non metuo quin meae uxori latae suppetiae sient.*

If the text is sound,—and we have no serious reason to question its correctness,—we have here an isolated instance of a verb of fearing with a *quin*-clause. The two things are by nature incongruous. Even a casual examination of the context, however, will suffice to show that a verb of fearing in its strict sense is not in any way called for,—in fact, is impossible, and in addition to this the *quin*-clause must suggest that the preceding verb, if not a natural one in and of itself to be used with *quin*, must have been suggested by analogy with some expression that does naturally take a *quin*-clause. I would therefore suggest that *metuo* in the

present example is used with somewhat the force of *dubito* or some similar word.

Other Extensions.

As. 675 : Numquam me orares quin darem.

Pers. 11 : erus meus manum apstinere hau quit tamen Quin mihi imperet, quin me suis negotiis praefulciat.

Bacch. 915 : abstinere quin attingas non queas.

CUR.

Poen. 533 : non justa causast quon curratur ?

St. 52 : Nequest quor studeam has nuptias mutarier.

QUAM OB REM.

Amph. 1142 : haud promeruit quam ob rem vitio vorteres.

Mirum Quin.

Kienitz, *de quin particulae usu* (p. 22-24), observes that the subjunctive after *mirum quin* is easily explicable on the same theory of deliberative origin as above maintained for the subjunctive after *nulla causa*, etc., but the regular meaning of the *quin*-clause after *mirum* makes it difficult to believe that the *quin*-clause had a deliberative origin. The deliberative, like all other phases of the volitive, looks forward to the future, whereas the *quin*-clause after *mirum* regularly refers to a present (or past) fact denied. The conclusion seems almost irresistible that the *quin*-clause in expressions of this sort is an indirect question, and that the original meaning in a sentence like *Amph.* 750 : *mirum quin te advorsus dicat*, was, 'it's strange why he doesn't contradict you' (obviously in sarcastic sense).¹ Nevertheless, it is

¹ It seems certain that the original mood in dependent questions was the indicative, and unless we do violence to the interpretation, it is still necessary to recognize the frequent occurrence of the indicative in indirect questions in Plautus. It is entirely possible, therefore, that the use of the subjunctive with *quin* in the indirect question after *mirum* resulted from the

not impossible that some adequate explanation of these *quin*-clauses as deliberative in origin may ultimately be advanced, and it has seemed best, therefore, to present the material here.

Pers. 339: Mirum quin regis Philippi caussa Te potius vendam.

Rud. 1393: Mirum quin tuom jus meo periculo aps te expetam.

Trin. 495: Mirum quin tu illo tecum divitias feras.

Aul. 85: Mirum quin tua me causa faciat Juppiter regem.

Amph. 750: Mirum quin te advorsus dicat.

Cis. 733: Mirum quin grex venalium in cistella infuerit una.

Trin. 967: Mirum quin ab avo ejus aut proavo acciperem.

Merc. 204: Mirum quin me subigitaret.

Pers. 433: Mirum quin tibi ego crederem.

Most. 493: Mirum quin vigilanti diceret.

universal use of the subjunctive in other subordinate clauses introduced by *quin*, and that the subjunctive in these indirect questions with *quin* contributed to the feeling for the propriety of using the subjunctive in indirect questions as a class. Other forces, of course, are to be recognized as contributing to the same end.

CHAPTER IV.

SUBSTANTIVE CLAUSES DEVELOPED FROM THE OPTATIVE SUBJUNCTIVE.

For the difficulty of a positive decision between a Jussive and an Optative origin after certain verbs, especially *volo*, see above on the Substantive Clause with *volo*, p. 20.

I. WITH VERBS OF WISHING, PREFERRING, CHOOSING, PRAYING, AND HOPING.

A. Subjunctive alone.

ORIGINAL USES.

i. Subjunctive precedes.

a) *volo*.

Truc. 473 : inveniat volo.

Pers. 832 : obsit volo.

Poen. 279 : At ego elixus sis volo.

Pers. 293 : eveniant volo tibi quae optas.

b) *velim*.

Cas. 559 : veniat velim.

Men. 909 : Adeas velim.

Aul. 670 : veniat velim.

Cas. 234 : Vera dicas velim.

Ps. 1061 : veniat velim.

Rud. 877 : Verum sit velim.

Truc. 481 : veniat miles velim.

Poen. 1288 : veniat velim.

Most. 1074 : veniat velim.

Bacch. 334 : Mihi dederit velim.

Poen. 570 : Quin etiam deciderint velim.

c) *vellem*.

Poen. 1066 : viverent vellem.

d) malo.

Poen. 289 : amet malim.

2. Subjunctive follows.

a) volo.

Ps. 1122 : Volo a me accipiat atque amittat.

Trin. 372 : Pol ego istam volo me rationem edoceas.

Rud. 1332 : Venus haec volo adroget te.

As. 77 : [volo amet me patrem].

Epid. 463 : (volo) Mihi illam ut tramittas, argentum accipias.

b) velim.

Rud. 511 : velim vomas.

c) vellem.

St. 312 : Nimis vellem hae fores erum fugissent.

d) malim.

Poen. 1184 : Malim istuc aliis videatur.

e) mavellem.

Bacch. 1047 : mavellem foret.

f) quaeso.

Amph. 934 : Quaeso . . . ut . . . iratus sies. AL. A, propitius sit potius.

g) adjuro.

Most. 183 : quomodo adjurasti ? ita ego istam amarem ?

Here *amarem* seems to be dependent on the notion of wishing involved in *adjurasti*. For this use of *adjuro*, see below, *Bacch.* 777.

DERIVED USES.

Extension within the Present.

Amph. Prol. 8-16 : voltis ea adferam.

Extensions in Tense.

Perfect.

Poen. 1206 : Velim de me aliquid dixerit.

Rud. 662 : Nimis velim improbissimo homini malas edentaverint.

B. Subjunctive with ut.

ORIGINAL USES.

1. Subjunctive precedes.

a) *volo.*

As. 720 : Opta id quod ut contingat tibi vis.

Bacch. 77 : Ut ille te videat volo.

Pers. 696 : ut requiram atque ut redimam volo.

Rud. 768 : ut vivas comburam id volo.

b) *precor.*

Rudens, 640 : te digna ut eveniant precor.

2. Subjunctive follows.

a) *volo.*

Most. 1098 : id maxime volo ut illi istoc confugiant.

Rud. 1220 : Sed scin quid est quod te volo? ut mi
Ampelisca nubat. . . . Licet. Atque ut experiar.

Epid. 463 : (volo) ut tramittas.

Cis. 119 : Numquid me vis? L^E. Ut valeas.

Men. 328 : Numquid vis? M^E. Ut eas.

Epid. 512 : Numquid me vis ceterum? P^E. ut pereas
atque abeas cito.

Poen. 911 : numquid aliud? M^I. Valeas beneque ut tibi sit.

Pers. 735 : Num quippiam aliud vis? D^O. Ut bene sit tibi.

b) *velim.*

Most. 632 : Velim . . . ut uno nummo plus petas.

c) *magis in mentem est (= malo, malim).*

Bacch. 130 : Magis in mentemst mihi ut haec
concurret cocus.

d) *opto.*

Miles. 1038 : di tibi dent quaequamque optes. M^I. Tecum aeta-
tem exigere ut liceat. P^Y. Nimium optas.

Miles, 669 : Quid ad illas artis optassis, si optio eveniat tibi?
P^L. ut referri pariter possit gratia.

e) *exopto*.

Men. 817 : exopto ut fiam.

f) *spero*.

Cis. 596 : Deos teque Spero. LA. Eosdem ego—nti abeas.

g) *veneror*.

Rud. 256 : veneror ut eximat ut aliquo auxilio adjuvet.

Rud. 1349 : Veneror te ut sient.

Poen. 950 : Deos deasque veneror . . . ut . . . siritis.

h) *oro*.

Trin. 56 : oro ut suppetat.

i) *obtestor*.

As. 18 : Ita ted obtestor Ut siet atque ut oppetas.

j) *quaeso*.

Amph. 720 : deos quaeso ut pariam.

Rud. 499 : Deosque immortalis quaeso uti habeas.

Cas. 389 : deos quaeso—— CHA. Ut feras.

Cas. 389 : deos quaeso—— CHA. Ut pendeas.

Cas. 390 : deos quaeso ut sortito eveniat.

Cas. 391 : deos quaeso ut emungare oculos.

Rud. 1256 : deos quaeso ut fiat.

Cas. 396 : Deos quaeso ut tua sors effugerit.

Miles, 1228 : et oro et quaeso Ut ejus mihi sit copia Benignusque erga me ut siet.

Amph. 934 : Quaeso ut semper iratus sies.

k) *invoco*.

Most. 529 : (Invoco) ut det.

l) *adjuro*.

Bacch. 777 : per omnis deos adjuro ut Ut lacerentur Ferratusque . . . conteras.

According to Harper's Lexicon, *s. v. adjuro*, this meaning of the word, *viz.*, 'beg,' 'intreat earnestly' is not found before Vopiscus. Cf. above p. 93. *Most.* 183.

Cas. 268: (*cupio*) ut detur.

DERIVED USES.

Extensions within the Present.

Rud. 1345: dic ut eradicet.

Rud. 874: (*exoptant*) ut id quod quaerant inveniant.

Ps. 276: voltis ut male sit mihi.

Cas. 431: expetivisse ut illi nuberet.

Merc. 908: Deos orato ut faciant.

Amph. Prol. 8-16: voltis ea uti nuntiem.

As. 783: tu pro illa ores ut sit.

Ps. 275: Sed scin quid nos volumus? ut male sit mihi.

Bacch. 369: quippe quo nemo advenit Nisi queni spes reliquere omnes esse ut frugi possiet. cf. Ausonius: *Consul ut ipse foret spes mihi certa fuit.*

Rud. 629: si speras ut sit.

Poen. 278: Venerem venerabor me ut amet.

Rud. 305: Venerem hanc veneremur ut nos adjuverit.

Trin. 39: venerare ut evenat Teque ut videam.

Extensions in Tense.

Imperfect.

Trin. 648: Praeoptavisti uti praeponeres.

Perfect.

Poen. 950: veneror ut venerim.

C. Subjunctive with ne.

ORIGINAL USES.

1. Subjunctive precedes.

Rud. 1067: At ne videoas velim.

Miles, 1086: numquid vis? PY. Ne magis sim pulcer.

DERIVED USE.

Cas. 431: expetivisse Ne ea mihi daretur.

D. Subjunctive with *ut ne*.

ORIGINAL USES.

Miles, 1050: Quid nunc tibi vis, mulier, memora. MI. Ut ne spernas.

Rud. 629: teque oro et quaeso Ut te ne pigeat.

2. QUAM - CLAUSES WITH VERBS OF WISHING, PREFERRING, ETC.

A. Subjunctive alone.

ORIGINAL USES.

a) *malim*.

Bacch. 717: [Sed quam fiat Mori malim.]

b) *mavellem*.

Bacch. 1047: mavellem foret quam revenisset domum.

c) *satius est*.

Cas. 111: hercle me suspendio Quam fias satiust mortuom.

DERIVED USES.

Extensions within the Present.

As. 121: moriri mavolet Quam non perfectum reddat.

As. 810: emori Me malim quam non indicem.

Aul. 661: Emortuom me mavelim Quam non dem.

The negative *non* clearly shows in all three of the above examples that we have to do with secondary extensions, as a *non indicem* in an original use would be impossible.

Extensions in Tense.

Imperfect.

Capt. 687: Meumque potius me caput periculo Praeoptavisse quam is periret ponere.

Aul. 11: optavit potius relinquere Quam commostraret.

B. Subjunctive with quam ut.

ORIGINAL USES.

a) *malim.*

Poen. 1184: Malim videatur quam ut coulaudes.

b) *satius est.*

Cis. 662: Nam quam ut sinam, satiust mihi interire.

3. WITH VERBS OF FEARING.**A. Subjunctive with ne.**

ORIGINAL USES.

1. Subjunctive precedes.

Cis. 673: Quae in tergum meum ne veniant male formido.

Mil. 904: nequid peccatis paveo.

Poen. 378: Atque hic ne me verberet illum faciat, male formido.

Poen. 1165: At ne inter vias Praeterbitamus metuo.

2. Subjunctive follows.

a) *metuo.*

Trin. 1170: metuo ne te leviorem erga me putas.

Aul. 61: metuo Ne mi verba duit Neu persentiscat.

Epid. 310: metuo Ne ulmos parasitos faciat.

Merc. 212: Metuo miser Ne patrem prehendat . . . suspicio.

Ps. 1026: metuo Ne deserat med atque ad hostis transeat.

Ps. 1028: Metuo autem ne erus redeat Ne capti praedones fuant.

Bacch. 156: metuo magis ne Phoenix fuam Teque esse mortuom renuntiem.

Circ. 222: Nil metuo nisi ne mediis disrumpar miser.

Mil. 279: SC. Metuo . . . Ne in malum cruciatumque insuliamus.

Poen. 883 : ego hoc metuo ne me perduim.

Bacch. 1196 : Quid metuis? NI. Ne obnoxius filio sim.

Amph. 334 : Metuo vocis ne vicem hodie hic vapulem.

Aul. 279 : malum maeorem metuo ne immixtum bibam.

mph. 307 : Metuo ne numerum augeam illum.

Men. 989 : Sed metuo ne sero veniam.

Pers. 315 : Metuo ne immaturam secem: ne exhibeat plus negotei.

Men. 861 : metuo nequid male faxit mihi.

Trin. 1042 : metuo ne aliam rem occipiat loqui.

Mil. 1237 : Metuo ne meam formam exsuperet.

Rud. 474 : Metuo hercle ne illa mulier mi insidias locet.

Rud. 1046 : Metuo ne uxor mea me extrudat.

Cas. 385 : metuo ne in aqua summa natet.

Mil. 492 : Metuo ne malo magno fuat.

Pers. 624 : Nunc metuo ne peccet.

Bacch. 985 : sed metuo ne idem cantent.

Mil. 996 : metuo mihi ne obsint neve opstent.

Merc. 586 : Metuo ego uxorem Ne illam hic offendat.

Men. 267 : Quid metuis? ME. Ne mihi damnum in Epidamno duis.

Merc. 276 : metuo ne illaec simiae partis ferat.

Merc. 275 : metuo ne uxor me castret mea.

Most. 268 : metuo ne olant argentum manus.

Ps. 1030 : metuo ne ille huic Harpax advenat.

Poen. 1292 : male ego metuo milvos: Mala illa bestiast: ne forte me auferat.

Ps. 1019 : metuo et formido male Ne malus sit Ne mihi obvortat cornua.

Bacch. 38 : Pol ego metuo lusciniolae ne defuerit cantio.

b) *formido*.

Most. 511 : formido ne manufesto hic me opprimat.

Amph. 304 : Formido male Ne ego hic nomen meum communtem et Quintus fiam.

As. 461 : formido miser ne hic me tibi arbitretur suasisse.

c) *adformido*.

Bacch. 1078: adformido ne is pereat neū corrumpatur.

d) *metuo et timeo*.

Miles, 1348: Metuoque et timeo ne hoc tandem propalam fiat Ne quis tibi hoc vitio vortat.

e) *with nouns after analogy of verbs of fearing*.

Capt. 91: Quod mihi ne eveniat periculumst.

As. 530: periculum portenditur ne nos moriamur.

Truc. 455: Quantast cura in animo, quantuni corde capio Dolorem, dolus ne occidat.

Miles, 1233: metus me macerat Ne oculi ejus sententiam mutent, Atque ejus elegantia meam extemplo speciem spernat.

DERIVED USES.

Extensions within the Present.

Men. 178: metuis . . . ne fores Samiae sint.

As. 743: ne uxor resciscat metuit.

Miles, 1150: periculum esse ne cadas?

Ps. 284: metuit ne illam venidas.

Pers. 541: (metuis) Ne quis vero ex Arabia penitissima persequatur?

Aul. 523: Compellarem . . . ni metuam ne desinat.

Cas. 575: Metuo ne non sit surda.

The type represented by this example must be an extension that arose only after *ne*-clauses with verbs of fearing were felt as clearly subordinate, for obviously such an originally independent expression as *ne non sit surda*, could scarcely be conceived.

Extensions in Tense.

Present Perfect.

On the origin of the tense in these examples see Delbrück, *Grundriss*, V, p. 292.

a) *metuo.**Most.* 550: Metuo ne techniae meae perpetuo perierint.*Most.* 542: Metuo ne quipiam inaudiverit.*Mil.* 428: Metuo maximie—ne nos nosmet perdiderimus.*As.* 286: metuo in communie nequam fraudem frausus sit.*Cas.* 304: metuo ne Olympionem mea uxor exoraverit.*Cas.* 575: Metuo ne audiverit.b) *timeo.**Truc.* 774: Timeo ne malefacta sint inventa omnia.c) *vereor.**Rud.* 390: eam veretur Ne perierit.

Imperfect.

a) *metuo.**Cas.* 908: Ferrum ne haberet metui.*Circ.* 684: metui ne mihi hodie apud praetorem solveret.*Poen.* 1378: metuei semper ne cognosceret.*Men.* 420: hunc metuebam ni meae Uxori renuntiaret.*Truc.* 201: metuebatque te ne tu sibi persuaderes.b) *paveo.**Pers.* 626: Nimis pavebam ne peccaret.

Pluperfect.

Ps. 912: metuebam male ne abisses.*Miles,* 720: Metuerem ne ibi diffregisset crura.

Negative Extensions.

a) *metuo.**Pers.* 478: Nec metuo ne quis mihi in jure abjurassit.*Bacch.* 1173: Non metuo nequid mihi doleat.*Cis.* 495: Hau metuo ne jus jurandum nostrum quisquam culpit.*Aul.* 609: Non metuo ne quisquam inveniat.*Miles,* 526: Nunc pol ego metuo nequid infuscaverit.*As.* 111: nemost quem metuam mihi Nequid nocere possit.b) *vereor.**Merc.* 380: Non vereor ne illam me amare hic potuerit resciscere.

Miles, 943 : Haud vereor ne pervincamur.

Capt. 308 : non verear ne imperet.

c) *formido*.

Circ. 45 : Minus formidabo ne excidat.

d) *periculum*.

As. 388 : Pol haud periculumst ne effrangantur.

Ps. 289 : Non periculumst nequid recte monstres.

Interrogative Extensions.

Merc. 160 : Dormientis spectatores metuis . . . ne excites ?

Pers. 357 : metuis ne te vendam ?

Bacch. 54 : quid metuis ? ne tibi lectus malitiam suadeat ?

Most. 596 : metuis nequo abeat foras ?

Pers. 686 : id metuebas miser, ne crumillam amitteres ?

Clauses Introduced by ne after an Implied Notion of Fearing.

I here group the following examples whose optative origin seems to me to be clear :

Men. 161 : Ne te uxor sequatur, respectas identidein.

This cannot mean 'in order that your wife may not follow you,' since the act of looking back cannot be conceived as preventing the wife's following. The clause clearly means 'for fear (*i. e.*, 'in fear') that your wife is following'.

Pers. 77 : visam hesternas reliquias nequis obreptaverit.

Capt. 127 : Ad alios captivos meos Visam ne nocte hac quippiam turbaverint.

No mark of punctuation should precede *visam*, for it is to be taken immediately with what precedes,—'I'll go to see my other captives, for fear they raised some row last night.'

Aul. 39 : Credo aurum inspicere volt, ne subreptum siet.

Rud. 1167 : qui non circumspexi centiens ne quis inspectaret ('for fear some one was looking').

Miles, 431 : ne claim quispiam Nos immutaverit.

Miles, 597 : prospectare, ne uspiam insidiae sient.

Miles, 1137 : circumspicite nequis adsit arbiter.

Miles, 955 : Circumspicedum, nequis nostro auceps sermoni siet.

Miles, 607: Sed speculabor, ne quis Nostro consilio venator adsit.

Aul. 647: Executedum pallium . . . Ne inter tunicas habeas.

Cure. 559: ne trapezita exulatum abierit.

Truc. 736: Discant dum mihi commentari liceat, ni oblitus siem.

Stich. 600: . . . at ille ne suscenseat.

Most. 922: . . . at enim nequid captionis mihi sit si dederim tibi.

Most. 968: Ita dico: ne ad alias aedis perperam deveneris.

B. Subjunctive with *ut*.

ORIGINAL USES.

Bacch. 762: Metuoque ut hodie possiem emolirier.

Cure. 464: Ornamenta quae locavi metuo ut possim recipere.

Pers. 319: metuo ut possim reicere in buble.

Most. 465: Metuo te atque istos expiare ut possies.

Miles, 355: At metuo ut satis sis subdola.

The Nature of the Subjunctive in Substantive Clauses Depending on Verbs of Fearing.

Certainly as old as Kühner is the theory that *ut* and *ne* in substantive clauses with verbs of fearing, are interrogative particles. Compare for instance the statement of Kühner in his *Ausf. Gram.*, ii, p. 823: "Die einfachste und natürlicheste Erklärung derselben scheint folgende zu sein: Der Lateiner fasst nach den angeführten Ausdrücken *ut* in der Bedeutung 'wie' auf *ne* aber haben die Lateiner in dieser Verbindung, wie μή die Griechen ohne Zweifel als ein Fragwort in der Bedeutung 'ob nicht' aufgefasst."

It was to be hoped that so unnatural an attempt at an explanation would never again be seriously undertaken, yet Lattmann in his recent study, *de conjunctivo Latino* (p. 89f.), has revived it. But this theory is arbitrary in its assumption of an interrogative force for *ne*, — a meaning nowhere found in the literature, and assumed specially for the explanation of these clauses as of interrogative origin. As regards the *ut*-clauses, it is

perhaps not psychologically impossible that *metuo ut veniat*, (originally 'I fear how he will come'), might have developed the meaning attaching to the clause in Latin, but any such theory fails to account for the use of the particle *ut* with independent optatives. This use, to be sure, while not a frequent one, is sufficiently well attested, and the intensive force of *ut* when combined with the optative is something that can hardly be denied. This value for *ut* is supported, too, by the much more frequent occurrence of the same particle with independent jussives in Plautus, Terence, and Cato.

It is disappointing that in Delbrück's recent volume completing the *Syntax* of Brugmann's *Grundriss* the construction under discussion receives such slight attention. In fact no advance whatever is there made, nor do any theories that justly should have consideration receive even citation. Compare, on the contrary, the statements of the same scholar in his *Conjunctiv und Optativ* (*Syntakt. Forschungen*, i), p. 22–23, where the negative force of the corresponding Greek *μή* is expressly recognized.

Attention might be called here to the fact that the Greek use of the subjunctive after a primary tense of a verb of fearing does not by any means necessarily impugn the optative theory of the origin of the constructions under consideration. Thus in φοβοῦμαι μή ἵκηται, it is perfectly conceivable that the subjunctive is due merely to the strongly assertive principle of using the subjunctive after primary tenses and the optative after secondary. The assumption of an original optative even after a primary tense cannot then be considered unwarrantable.

A word should be said with reference to the theory in accordance with which the substantive clauses under consideration are referred for their origin to the Volitive Subjunctive; cf. e.g., Professor Hale's *Synopsis of the Modal Uses of the Finite Verb*. Psychologically, this view involves a serious difficulty. In the sentence, *metuo ne veniat*, for instance, if I am in a position to say *ne veniat* as an order or command (Jussive), is it conceivable that I am afraid that my order will not be executed? A state of fear is not consistent with the condition under which one issues a peremptory order.

Is it not much more natural to posit for the *ne veniat*, an original optative force: 'may he not come'? A person expressing a wish that something over which he has no control may not happen, is quite likely to fear the non-realization of his wish, and to give expression to this feeling of anxiety. Just so an independent *ut veniat* would have meant, 'just let him come'; 'O that he may only come'. This when subordinated to a *metuo* would naturally yield a sentence that we may paraphrase by the English, 'I fear that he *will not* come', while *metuo ne veniat* just as naturally gives, 'I fear that he *will* come'.

This explanation accounts adequately and consistently for the genesis of the construction, and for its historical development. The theory here maintained seems to receive additional support from the examples cited above (p. 102) of clauses introduced by *ne* that depend on an implied expression of fearing. It is sometimes difficult to decide in sentences of this type whether we are dealing with a substantive clause depending immediately on a verb of fearing understood, or with a dependent adverbial purpose clause. Incidentally, I should maintain that we are not justified in referring all adverbial purpose clauses for their origin to the volitive phase of the subjunctive mood. Some of them, at least, it seems almost necessary to interpret as of original optative character. In either case, however, our conclusion with reference to the negative *ne* must be the same, *i. e.*, it is a negative and not an interrogative particle.

For the view that the substantive clause with a verb of fearing is a development of the optative, see among others Bottek, *Die Ursprüngliche Bedeutung des Konjunktivs in lateinischen Nebensätzen*, p. 19; Bennett, *Appendix to Latin Grammar* § 389; Cauer, *Grammatica Militans*, p. 119 f. Each of these scholars calls attention to the fact that the colloquial English and German translations, respectively, do not actually represent in exact identity the thought of the Latin, but express merely an implication of that thought, since the English *that*-clause in 'I fear that he will come', and the corresponding *dass*-clause in German, represent original dependent clauses, not original independent ones, as were the clauses introduced by *μή*, *ne*, *ut*.

The view that in the substantive clauses under consideration we are dealing with substantive clauses of purpose hardly calls for serious consideration, although such a classification is made by the authors of many of our current school grammars, American and German. For instance, Stegmann cites "Finale Ergänzungssätze als Objekt der Verba des Fürchtens." Friedersdorff says "Die Verba des Fürchtens haben das Objekt bei sich in Form eines finalen Ergänzungssatzes." Deecke curiously recognizes a twofold origin in his § 459: "Der Grund der Abweichung vom deutschen Sprachgebrauch liegt wieder darin, dass der lateinische Nebensatz mit *ut* eigentlich ein Wunschsatz war, derjenige mit *ne* ein Prohibitiv- oder Averrunkationssatz."

The optative origin is, on the contrary, apparently recognized by Ziemer-Gilhausen, and is expressly recognized by Schmalz-Wagener.

4. TEMPORAL SUBSTANTIVE CLAUSES OF OPTATIVE ORIGIN INTRODUCED BY DUM AND UT.

A. With DUM.

ORIGINAL USES.

i. Subjunctive precedes.

Poen. 929: dum erus adveniat a foro opperiar domi.

Rud. 328: Nunc quid milii meliust quam ilico hic opperiar erum dum veniat?

Miles, 1249: Immo opperiamur dum exeat aliquis.

DERIVED USES.

Extensions within the Present.

Bacch. 48: atque is dum veniat sedens ibi opperibere.

Men. 882: Manendo medicum dum se ex opere recipiat.

Extension in Tense.

Imperfect.

Trin. 170: observavit dum dormitaret canes.

Negative Extensions.

Truc. 843 : haud mansisti dum ego darem illam.

Ps. 1234 : ne expectetis dum hac domum redeam via.

Truc. 482 : Ne expectetis, spectatores, meas pugnas dum praedicem.

Cis. 782 : ne exspectetis dum illi huc ad vos exeant.

Rud. 922 : Non enim illum expectare oportet dum erus se ad suom suscitet officium.

B. With UT.

Here I unhesitatingly place the following examples, which are simply present extensions of independent optatives with *ut*, such as are repeatedly met with in Plautus; Cf. e. g., *ut eum dipendant, etc.*

Trin. 734 : nisi exspectare vis Ut eam sine dote frater nuptum conlocet.

St. 58 : manet ut moneatur.

Other theories have been advanced concerning the origin of the *dum*- and *ut*-clauses after verbs of expectation. Thus Hale, *Anticipatory Subjunctive*, p. 68, refers the subjunctive to that use of the Indo-European subjunctive that he designates 'Anticipatory,' which certainly is well preserved in Greek in the Homeric poems. But as long as no instances occur in Latin of an Anticipatory Subjunctive in principal clauses, it would seem safer not to recognize it in subordinate clauses, particularly if another satisfactory explanation can be afforded.

A second theory explains the *dum*-clause as so charged with the purpose idea that it takes the subjunctive after the analogy of purpose clauses introduced by *ut*, but this is rather a comment on the developed meaning of the clause than an adequate explanation of its origin. If the *dum*-clause in its origin did denote purpose, then of course it would have been entirely natural that it should stand in the subjunctive, but the question to determine is how a purpose notion arose. In other words, the problem is to discover how *dum*, originally an adverb in the sense of 'the while,' came to acquire the prospective force of a conjunction in

the sense of ‘until’. Until this question is answered, the purpose theory of the origin of these clauses is a mere *petitio principii*.

To me, the *dum*-clause in *rusticus exspectat dum defluat amnis* is clearly of optative origin. The optative *dum*-clause in adverbial function is freely used at all periods of the language to denote a wish entertained in the mind of the logical subject of the main clause, *e.g.*, Hor. *Sat.* i, 1.40: *Nil obstet tibi dum ne sit te ditior alter*, ‘nothing is an obstacle to you in your desire that no one be richer than you’; *multa honesta neglegunt dum modo potentiam consequantur*, where the meaning cannot be ‘provided they obtain power’ but only ‘in their desire to attain power’; Pl. *Asin.* 429: *Operam assiduam dedo dum reperiam* (‘in my desire to discover’). It is precisely this use, in developed substantive value, that I recognize in *rusticus exspectat dum defluat amnis* (‘the peasant waits in the desire that the river may flow away’), and the allied expressions collected above.

CHAPTER V.

SUBSTANTIVE CLAUSES DEVELOPED FROM THE SUBJUNCTIVE OF CONTINGENT FUTURITY.

I. SUBSTANTIVE CLAUSES OF RESULT.¹

These are introduced by *ut* and *ut non*, and, unlike the clauses with *ut* and *ne* considered in the earlier part of this investigation, are developed not from independent uses of the subjunctive, but from adverbial clauses that have secondarily taken on a substantive meaning, *i. e.*, substantive clauses of result are a development of clauses of pure result.

This category in Plautus is not a large one. From it I have rigidly excluded all clauses introduced by *ne* and all clauses introduced by *ut* after verbs that are ever followed by either a *ne*-clause or a simple subjunctive without *ut*. This procedure I am well aware is at a variance with that of many grammarians.²

But inasmuch as *ne* was originally the negative of the jussive and optative, it seems a duty to refer to a jussive or optative origin all subordinate clauses introduced by *ne*. That such an explanation is not only possible but also easy and natural will, I am confident, hold for the entire Latinity. That it will hold for Plautus, has I believe been demonstrated in the earlier part of this investigation. Thus in *impercio ne abeas*, the *ne abeas* is a jussive development. To the Latin mind, *impercio* should be conceived as meaning 'to succeed in one's request,' and the dependent clause must originally have been suggested by the idea of

¹ For the potential origin of the clause of pure result, see Bennett, *App. to Lat. Gr.* § 372.

² E. g., Gildersleeve, *Lat. Gram.*, § 553; Schmalz, *Lat. Synt.*, p. 405; Kühner, *Ausf. Lat. Gram.*, ii. § 187; Dräger, *Histor. Synt.*, ii. § 542; and especially Sven Tessing *Synt. Plaut.*, pp. 28-9, who perhaps goes furthest in classifying as clauses of result, clauses whose jussive origin seems to be unquestionable.

requesting contained in the governing verb. So too with *efficere*; just as *facio* means ‘see to it’, ‘make effort’, so *efficere* means ‘to be successful in one’s effort,’ and is construed with a *ne*-clause (of jussive origin), just as naturally as *fac*, *cura*, or *vide*. Compare also *impello*, *persuadeo*, ‘to be successful in advice’. A similar explanation will I believe suffice to explain adequately and conclusively the truly jussive origin of clauses introduced by *ne* and *ut ne* even where certain fairly adequate forms of English translation might suggest a substantive clause of result.

A. Subjunctive with *ut*.

a) *evenit*.

Ps. 685: atque hoc evenit In labore ut mors obrepat.

Miles, 889: eveniet Obliviosa ut fiat, meminisse nequeat.

Bacch. 1068: Evenit ut ovans praeda onustus cederem.

Most. 173: Virtute formae id evenit te ut deceat quicquid habeas.

Poen. 1169: Id eventurum esse Ut haec inveniantur hodie esse hujus filiae.

Pers. 535: Neque eveniet tali ut in luto haereum.

b) *contigit*.

Amph. 187: id contigit ut salvi poteremur domi.

c) *sors obtingit*.

Cas. 300: obtinget sors. LY. Ut quidem pol pereas.

d) *potest fieri*.

Amph. 567: nec potest fieri duobus locis ut simul sit?

Amph. 592: Quo pacto potest Fieri uti tu et hic sis et domi?

Poen. 1056: qui potuit fieri ut Carthagini gnatus sis?

Pers. 173: potuisset jam fieri ut probe litteras sciret.

Trin. 731: fieri ferme non potest Ut eam perpetiar ire in matrimonium.

e) *facio, committo*.

Amph. 185: Facit ille quod volgo haud solent, ut quod se sit dignum sciat.

Curc. 258 : Facit hic quod pauci, ut sit magistro obsequens.

St. 603 : faciet ut deeipiat.

Aul. 740 : Cur id ausu's facere, ut id quod non tuom esset tangeres?

Merc. 993 : numquam facerem ut abducerem.

Amph. 493 : nam deum non par videtur facere ut sinat.

Aul. 478 : si idem faciant ceteri, Ut indotatas ducant uxores domum.

The foregoing seven examples are apparently the only instances of a substantive clause of result occurring in Plautus after *facio*. Even these examples, I have hesitatingly put in this place; yet careful study of them has inclined me to believe that they are by origin radically different from the substantive clauses with *facio* considered above, p. 40 ff. In these examples, it will be noted that *facio* has the simple meaning of 'to do', and that the subjects of the main and the dependent clause are identical. Being affirmative, none of these clauses throws light upon their origin through the negative employed with it.

Similar to the above is the well known passage from Cie. *Cat. Maj.* xii, 42 : *invitus feci ut Flamininum e senatu ejicerem*; but this likewise can hardly be other than a somewhat awkward periphrasis for *invitus ejeci*.

Trin. 704 : id me commissurum ut patiar fieri ne animum induxeris.

f) *fio.*

Bacch. 1209 : ui antehac vidissemus fieri Ut rivales filiis fierent.

As. 478 : fiet ut vapules.

Amph. 431 : Factumst illud ut vini hirneam ebiberim meri.

g) *est.*

Poen. 1072 : Sed si itast ut tu sis Jalonis filius.

Ps. 1319 : numquam ratus sum Fore me ut tibi fierem supplex.

h) *After nouns, as predicate or appositive.*

Trin. 637 : An id est sapere ut qui beneficium repudies?

Amph. Prol. 46: mos numquam illi fuit Ut exprobraret.

Curec. 377: Habent hunc morem plerique argentarii, Ut alius alium poscant, reddant nemini, Pugnis rem solvant, si quis poscat clarus.

Merc. 513: Nec mos meus ut praedicem.

Truc. 7: resident mores Ad denegandum ut celeri lingua utamini.

Men. 723: an mos hic itast, Peregrino ut narrent fabulas?

Bacch. 606: Iu enim haec revenit res locum ut quid consili dem nesciam.

Poen. 625: thensaurus stultis in lingua situs, Ut quaestui habeant male loqui.

Amph. 839: Non ego illam dotem dico esse sed ut minnifica sim bonis, prosimi probis.

i) *With possessive adjectives used substantively (meum est, tuum est), possessive genitives used predicatively, etc.*

As. 190: Nec meum(st) quidem ad te ut mittam.

Capt. 583: Est miserorum ut malevolentes sint atque invident bonis.

Most. 789: Antiquom optines hoc tuom, tardus ut sis.

Pers. 46: Hoc meumst ut faciam sedulo.

Merc. 629: de istac re argutus es, ut par pari respondeas.

j) *With satin (= nonne est).*

Bacch. 491: Satin ut nescias?

k) *Introduced by nisi ut.*

Ps. 1109: Nec boni ingeni in is inest, Nisi ut improbis se artibus teneant.

In this example there is evidently an ellipsis, which I should supply thus: *nec ullum ingenium in is inest nisi ut*, etc. For the interpretation of the *ut*-clause as one of result, cf. the similar construction with *mos est*, *meum est*, etc., above; cf. also Suet. *Calig.* 23: *Aviac Antoniae secretum petenti denegavit, nisi ut interveniret Macro praefectus*, where we have a similar ellipsis of *factum esset* after *nisi*.

1) *convenit*, 'it tallies'.

Capt. 649 : Convenit . . Ut processerim. Cf. *Ter.*
Phor. 772 : Verissime. DE. Ut stultissime quidem illi rem gesserimus, 'it's as true as the gospel'; 'yes, that we've managed the affair like blockheads.'

2. SUBSTANTIVE CLAUSES INTRODUCED BY QUASI WITH SIMULO, ADSIMULO, DISSIMULO, CONSIMILE EST.

a) *simulo*.

As. 796 : simulet quasi gravedo profluat.

Pers. 677 : Simulato quasi eas prorsum in navem.

Circ. 391 : Simulabo quasi non noverim.

Pers. 84 : Simulabo quasi non videam.

Miles, 796 : ita praecipo mulieri atque ancillulae,

Ut simulet se tuam esse uxorem et deperire hunc militem
Quasique hunc anulum faveae suae dederit, ea porro mihi,
Militi ut darem : quasique ego rei simi interpres.

Miles, 909 : Quasi militi animum adjeceris simulare

Quasique anulum hunc ancillula tua abs te detulerit.

Amph. 200 : quasi adfuerim tamen simulabo.

b) *adsimulo*.

Amph. 115 : Sed ita adsimulavit se quasi Amphitruo siet.

Miles, 1170 : Ita volo adsimulare quasi spernas tuam Quasique ejus opulentatem reverearis.

Miles, 1182 : adsimulato quasi gubernator sies.

Poen. 600 : adsimulatote quasi ego simi peregrinus Et quidem quasi tu oraveris.

Epid. 195 : adsimulato quasi per urbem totam quae-
siveris.

Miles, 1163 : Nempe ut adsimulem me amore istius differi Qua-
sique istius causa amoris Abierim.

St. 84 : adsimulabo quasi quam cuipam admiserint.

c) *dissimulo*.

Cas. 771 : Sed nimium lepide dissimulant quasi nil sciant.

Mil. 992 : Dissimulabo his quasi non videam neque esse hic
etiamdum sciām.

d) consimile est.

Miles, 820: Sed quia consimilest quoniam stertas quasi sorbeas.

The *quasi*-clause here is different from those above illustrated in that the substantive idea here stands in the relation of a dependent genitive.

e) allego.

Ps. 1162: Pseudolus tuos allegavit hunc, quasi a Macedonio milite esset.

Trin. 1141: Meo adlegatu venit quasi qui aurum mihi ferret aps te.

It is interesting, and perhaps significant, that in both these examples we have the word *allego*, in the sense of 'send on a commission'. We are in fact almost led to the conclusion that the *quasi*-clause in each case stands in the relation of internal object to the form of *allego*.

On the subject of the *quasi* clauses with *simulo*, etc., compare the article of Bennett in Wölfflin's *Archiv*, XI, 3, p. 405 f: *Die mit tamquam und quasi eingeleiteten Substantivsätze*, where recognition of the substantive character of the construction is made for the first time.

It may not be amiss to justify our calling these sentences substantive, since it will perhaps be suggested by some that the sentences are really adverbial clauses of comparison, and not substantive at all. Let us take for example the sentence *simulo quasi aegrotarem*. In this the *quasi aegrotarem* is not an adverbial clause of comparison, for the sentence does not mean, "I am pretending as I should pretend if I were sick," but means simply "I am pretending", and the *quasi*-clause is the 'something' that I am pretending, and that 'something' is "as if I were sick"; hence the *quasi*-clause is just as much the object of *simulo* as the infinitive *aegrotare* is in the sentence *simulo me aegrotare*; as a matter of fact the infinitive after *simulo* is entirely equivalent to a *quasi*-clause.

In the article of Bennett referred to above, no explicit discussion of the nature of the subjunctive in the *quasi*-clause is entered upon, it being apparently taken for granted that the phase of the

subjunctive would be understood to be the 'should-would' or more exactly a development of the optative of contingent futurity.

That this is really the nature of the Subjunctive, it is here maintained.

3. SUBSTANTIVE QUOM-CLAUSES.

Bacch. 955 : tria fata quae illi forent exitio : si periisset alterum tertium quom portae Phrygiae limen superum scinderetur.

Miles, 820 : Sed quia consimilest quom stertas quasi sorbeas.

Epid. 624 : Estne consimilis quasi quom signum pictum pulcre aspexeris ?

ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA.

p. 13, after line 14, add :

c) *allego*.

Poen. 1099 : *nt te allegemus filias dicas tuas surruptasque adseras.*

p. 17, 9 lines from bottom, *Merc.* 60 belongs on p. 19, after *Capt.* 752.

p. 27, after *Pers.* 634, add Extension by Analogy, *Trin.* 591 : *Tandem impetravi abiret.*

p. 28, 6 lines from bottom, add *Capt.* 244.

p. 37, lines 10, 12, and 13 belong with *Poen.* 730, p. 35.

p. 38, after line 9, add *Truc.* 637.

p. 49, after *Cis.* 523, add *Poen.* 1252.

p. 51, after line 19, add *Truc.* 396.

p. 51, after *Ps.* 72, add *Rud.* 598.

p. 62, *dele C* with the example *Amph.* 924, there quoted.

p. 72, after *Rud.* 1230, add :

Aul. 747 : *Jus est ut possies.*

Bacch. 994 : *Justumst ut serviat.*

The latter is probably an original use.

p. 80. The last example, *Most.* 1170, belongs under B, p. 81.

p. 82, add :

SUBSTANTIVE SI-CLAUSES.

Bacch. 953 : *Ilio tria fuisse audivi fata quae illi forent exitio : Signum ex arce si periisset, alterum tertium.*

Persa. 354 : *Non ego inimicitias omnis pluris existimmo quam mensa inanis nunc si apponatur mihi. Cf. Cic. *Lael.* xi, 37 : Nulla est igitur excusatio peccati, si amici causa peccaveris.*

INDEX OF THE MORE IMPORTANT PASSAGES
DISCUSSED.

	PAGE.		PAGE.		PAGE.			
<i>Amph.</i>	84, 225, 630, 750, 1106,	80 67 54 90 89	<i>Epid.</i>	315, 471, 699, Men.	64 60 68 102	<i>Pers.</i>	136, 605, 1050,	80 9 9
<i>Asin.</i>	103, 234, 429,	48 65 108		569, 725, 866, 966,	35 88 42 77	<i>Poen.</i>	280, 501, 950, 1242,	17 83 11 68
<i>Aul.</i>	155, 251, 309, 434, 661,	64 67 32 67 97		1100,	75	<i>Pseud.</i>	207, 236, 553, 633, 912, 1101,	74 64 85 70 11 46
<i>Bacch.</i>	369, 749, 777,	96 19 95		536, 712, 990, 992 ^a ,	64 46 62 26	<i>Rud.</i>	1109, 1162,	112 114
<i>Capt.</i>	115, 127, 257, 267, 378, 395, 525, 649, 694, 737,	6 102 76 49 66 66 88 113 13 49	<i>Merc.</i>	51, 279, 497, 502,	14 49 71 81	<i>Stich.</i>	624, 746, Trin.	14 33 75
<i>Cas.</i>	75, 575,	69 100	<i>Mil.</i>	72, 745, 820, 920, 1101, 1398,	72 80 87 72 42		104, 293, 587, 1141,	77 77 89 114
<i>Cis.</i>	760,	73	<i>Most.</i>	183, 389, 420, 539,	93 49 75 75	<i>Truc.</i>	275, 774,	68 11
<i>Curc.</i>	164, 563, 663,	88 66 65		706, 848, 876, 992, 1053,	48, 81 9 12 66 49	<i>Vid.</i>	88,	89

INDEX OF SUBJECTS AND GOVERNING WORDS.

- absterreo*, 74, 75.
accedit animus, 84.
adcurso, 50.
addo operam, 53 f.
adfecto viam, 79.
adformido, 9, 100.
adigo, 35.
adjuro, 93, 95.
adlego, 80.
admoltor, 51, 116.
adnitor, 50.
adsimulo, 113.
 Advising, 35.
aequon est, 71, 72, 73.
aequon videtur quin, 89.
ago, 34, 51.
alieno quin, 87.
allego, 114, 116.
 Allowing, 60.
amo, amabo, 26, 28, 30.
amplector genua, 29.
animatus sum, 84.
animum confirmare, 84.
animum domo, 38.
animum induco, 37, 39.
animum ostendo, 63.
animum vingo, 39.
animum vingo quam, 80.
animus accedit, 84.
 Analogy, extensions by, 12, 18, 25, 32, 34, 35, 37, 38, 39, 48, 55, 74.
ansa, 62.
 Anticipatory Subjunctive, 107.
apparo, 79.
apstineo, 90.
arcesso, 16.
astutia, 51.
auctorem do, 35.
auctor sum, 35, 36, 37.
audeo quin, 88.
auris obtundo, 18.
 Begging, Requesting, etc., 26 ff.
canto, 36.
Cave, 54 ff.
Cave facias, origin of construction, 54 f.
cave ne, 57 ff.
Cave ne facias, origin of construction, 59.
causa ea, 80.
causa est quod, 79.
causa est ut, 76.
causa justa cur, 90.
causa, causae, numquid, nulla, 85.
cautior, 59.
cautio est, 59.
censeo, 35, 116.
certa res est, 84.
certissimumst, 84.
certumst, 83, 84.
 Choosing, 92 ff.
circumspicio, 102.
clamito, 16.
cogo, 38, 39.
committo, 62, 111.
commoditas, 62.
 Compelling, 35.
conprimo quin, 86.
concedo, 61.
condicio, 65, 67.
conduco, 64, 66, 87.
confirmare animum, 84.
conjuro, 64.
consequor, 48.
consilium do, 36.
consimile est, 114.
constituo, 84.
 Context, depending on, 16, 30, 116.
contigit, 110.
contincre quin, 86.
 Contingent Futurity, 2, 3.
convenit, 36, 66, 67, 113.
copia, 61, 62.
cupio, 96.
Cur, 90.
curu, 50, 100.
curo, 40n., 50, 51, 52.
dare documentum, 19.
dare signum, 19.
decerno, 83.
debet, 71.
 Deciding, 63.
 Deliberative Subjunctive, substantive clauses developed from, 85 ff.
depello quin, 87.
deprecor, 34.
 Derived Uses, 10 f.
 Deserving, 75.
 Determined resolution, 2 ; substantive clauses developed from, 83 ff.
deterreo, 74, 89.
deterreo quin, 86.
dico, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 96, 103.
dignus, 76.
ditigens sum, 54.
disco, 17, 103.
dissimulo, 113.
do, 61.
do auctorem, 35.
do consilium, 36.
do operam, 40n., 53 f.
do pignus ni, 68.
do tabellas, 32.
doceo, 16, 17.
documentum dabo, 19.
dolor, 100.
dolum, 51.
domo animum, 38.
dono, 61.
dos, 112.
dotis quid, 65.
dubito quin, 86.
 Dum with temporal substantive clauses, 106 f.
edico, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19.
edicta, 18.
edoceo, 16.
efficio, 48.
eminor, 18.
epistulas mitto, 32.
esse auctor, 35, 36, 37.
est cur, 90.
est, hoc quod, 79.
est in manu, 75, 88.
excutio, 103.
 Exempting, 77.
exopto, 95, 96.
exoro, 32, 34, 35, 37, 87.
expecto, 107.
expeto, 32, 34, 96.
exsculpo, 38.
exsequor, 48.
 Extensions, 10 f ; within the present, 11 ; in tense, 11 ; negative, 12 ; interrogative, 12 ; by analogy, 12 ; passive, 12.

- exterebro*, 48.
evenit, 110.
fabrica, 51.
facinus, 73.
facio, 110 f.
Facio, 'see to it,' 40 ff.
facio gratiam, 77.
facio mentionem, 30, 31, 34.
facio, numquam quin, 88.
facto, opus, usus est, 48.
saxim, 42 f.
faxo, 42 f.
fallacia, 51.
famam tradere, 37.
Fearing, 98 ff.
Fearing, implied notion of, 102 f.
Fearing, Nature of the Substantive Clause with verbs of, 103–106.
fero tabulas, 17.
fieri potest, 110, 116.
fio, 111.
flagito, 15.
Forcing, 38.
formido, 98 ff; 102.
genua amplexor, 29.
gero, 50.
Granting, 60.
gratia, 79.
gratiam facio, 77.
hoc est quod, 79.
Hoping, 92 ff.
hortor, 36.
Hypotaxis, 3 f.
id, with substantive clause of purpose, 79.
id est, 111 f.
impero, 15, 17.
impetro, 32, 37, 116.
impetro quam, 80.
indico, 19.
Indirect Questions, 90.
Inducing, 35, 37, 39, 87.
induco, 38.
induco animum, 37, 39.
inspicio, 102.
instat, 39.
instituo, 13.
instruo, 80.
interdico, 13, 19.
interminor, 18.
Interrogative extensions, 33, 37.
ita, 49.
invito, 30.
invoco, 29, 30, 95.
jubeo, 13, 14, 15, 17.
- judico*, 63.
jus est, 116.
Jussive Subjunctive, 2;
Substantive Clauses developed from 8–82.
justa causa cur, 90.
justum est, 116.
legibus pactis, 67.
taqueus et redimiculum, 116.
lex, 64, 65, 77.
licet, 60.
litteris signo, 16.
litteras mitto, 32.
toco, 66.
locus, 112.
machina, 51.
magis in mentem est, 94.
malo, 24, 93, 97, 98.
maneo, 106, 107.
mando, 14, 15, 17, 19.
manu, est in, 75, 88.
melius est, 71.
melius est quam, 80.
memor sum, 54.
mentem, magis est in, 94.
mentem, venire in, 36.
mentionem facio, 30, 31, 34.
merces, 62.
mereo, 75, 76.
metuo, 98 ff, 102, 103.
metuo et timeo, 100.
metuo quin, 89.
metus, 100.
meum est ut, 112.
minus, quo, 80.
mirum quin, 90 f.
mitto, 16, 61.
mitto litteras, epistulas, 32.
mitto (verbis) paucis, 30.
modo, 65, 67.
modum, quem ad, 66.
moneo, 35, 39.
monstro, 16, 19.
moro quin, 87.
mos, 112.
multa, 15, 16.
ne, nei, ni, neu, neve, 3.
necesse est, 73.
Negative extensions, 37.
negotium quin, 88.
nequeo, 89.
nequeo quin, 88.
ni, 34, 68 f.
nihil est quod, 77 f.
nil est, 66.
nil seio quod, 78.
- nitor*, 50.
nisi, 46.
nolo, 25 f.
non, neque, 3.
non possum quin, 87.
Nouns with predicate or appositive substantive clauses, 111 f.
Nouns with substantive clauses after analogy of verbs, 18, 72, 100.
nulla causa, 85.
numquid causae, 85.
numquid vis, 21 f, 96.
numquid vis quin, 86.
nuntio, 16.
nuto, 19.
obtestor, 28, 33, 95.
obtingo sors, 63.
obtundo auris, 18.
obsecro, 26, 27, 30, 31, 33, 34.
observo, 106.
occasio, 62.
occurro, 74.
officium, 72.
operam addo, 53.
operam do, 40 n., 53.
opterior, 106.
Optative *dum* and *ut* clauses, 106–108.
Optative of contingent futurity, 2, 3, 109 ff.
Optative, original force, 2.
Optative, Substantive Clauses Developed from 92 ff.
optingit, 110.
opto, 94, 97.
optimum est, 71, 72.
opus est, 73, 74.
opus, usus, est facto, 48.
oro, 26, 28, 29, 31, 33, 34, 95, 96, 116.
oro et quaeso, 97.
oro quin, 90.
ostendo animum, 63.
pactis legibus, 67.
pacto, 64, 65, 67.
paenitet, 67.
Parataxis, 3 f.
paratum, 63.
paratus, 79.
parco, 77.
parito, 79.
paro, 63.
patior, 61.
patior quin, 88.
paucis (verbis) mitto, 30.

paveo, 98, 101.
perdoceo, 16, 17.
perduco, 38.
perficio, 48.
periculum, 100, 102.
 Permitting, 60.
perpello, 38.
perpetro, 48.
persuadeo, 37, 38, 39, 116.
pignus, 68.
placeet, 63.
possum, *non quin*, 87.
possum quin, 89.
postulo, 31.
postulo quin, 89.
potestas, 62.
potest fieri, 110, 116.
potin, 69 ff.
praecipio, 15, 16, 19.
praedico, 14, 15, 18.
praemonstro, 14.
praeopto, 96, 97.
 Praying, 92 ff.
precor, 94.
 Preferring, 92 ff.
prohibeo, 74, 82.
prohibeo quin, 86.
promereo, 76, 90.
promeritum, 76.
prospecto, 102.
prospicio, 51.
 Proviso, Substantive Clauses of, 77.
provoco, 16.
 Purpose, relative clause developing into substantive, 80, 81.
 Purpose, Substantive Clauses of, 8 f., 79.
quaeso, 26, 27, 33, 34, 93, 95.
quam, jussive, 80.
quam ne, 82.
quam ob rem, 80, 90.
quam ut, 81, 116.
quam with determined resolution, 84.
quam with verbs of Wishing, Preferring, etc., 97.
quem ad modum, 66.
 Questions, Indirect, 90 f.
qui (adverb), 6, 51.
quid dotis, 65.

quid ea usus est, 79.
quid eo opus, 79.
quid est quod, 77 f.
quid vis, 97.
quin, 85 ff.
quin, mirum, 90 f.
quod, hoc est, 79.
 Quom-substantive clauses, 115.
quo minus, 80.
quor, 90.
rabo, 65.
re, ex tua, 72.
recuso quin, 88.
 Refraining, 77.
rem, in tuam, 72.
rem, quam ob, 80.
remoror quin, 87.
repperio, 33.
repremo quin, 86.
 Requesting, Begging, etc., 26 ff.
res with substantive clause of purpose, 79.
respecto, 102.
 Resolution, Determined, 2, 83 ff.
 Resolving, 63.
respondeo, 17.
 Result; substantive clauses of, 109 ff.
retineo quin, 86, 89.
rogito, 31.
rogo, 27, 28, 30, 31.
satius est, 97, 98.
sententia, 36, 63, 84.
si clauses, substantive, 116.
signo litteris 16.
signum, 66.
signum dedit, 19.
simulo, 113.
sino, 60, 61.
sors obtingo, 63, 110.
spectamen, 77.
speculator, 103.
spero, 95, 96.
spes, 96.
slatuo, 63.
 Stipulative Clauses, 64 ff.
 Striving, 50.
studeo, 50.
suadeo, 35, 36, 39, 40.
subigo, 38.

Subjunctive of Anticipation, 107; of Contingent Futurity, 109 ff; nature with verbs of fearing, 103 ff; of determined resolution, 2; original force, 1.
 Substantive Clauses. See Contents.
sum auctor, 35, 36, 37.
suppeto, 79.
sycophantia, 51.
tabellas do, 32.
tabulas fero, 17.
techina, 51.
tela, 51.
temporo, 77.
 Temporal Substantive Clauses, 106 ff.
tempus est, 71, 72.
teneo quin, 86.
timeo, 101.
tradere famam, 37.
usus est, 16, 73, 74.
usus est ea quid, 79.
usus, opus, est facto, 48.
Ut, 5 f., 9; with temporal substantive clauses, 107 f.
ut ne, 19.
veneror, venero, 32, 34, 95, 96.
venit in mentem, 36.
verbis arcesso, 16.
verbum, 36.
vereor, 101, 102.
viam adfecto, 79.
video, 40 n.
video, 'see to it,' 52 ff.
videtur aequom, 72.
videtur aequom quin, 89.
vin, 23.
vinco, 39.
vinco animum, 39.
vinco animum quam, 80.
vinco quin, 87.
vis, visne, 23.
vis, numquid quin, 86.
viso, 102.
vocito, 17.
volo, 'I want you to,' 20 ff.
volo, optative, 92 ff.
 Wishing, 92 ff.

NEW BOOKS FOR THE CLASSICAL LIBRARY

PHILOLOGICAL.

GILES.—A Short Manual of Comparative Philology for Classical Students. *Second Edition, Revised.* By P. GILES, University of Cambridge. 12mo, cloth. 619 pp. \$3.25 net.

TEXTS, WITH NOTES, Etc.

DEMOSTHENES.—Selected Orations. On the Peace—Second Philippic—On the Chersonesus and Third Philippic. Edited by JOHN E. SANDYS. \$1.10 net.

DIONYSIUS.—Dionysius of Halicarnassus. The Greek Text of the Three Literary Letters, with Translation, Facsimile, Glossary, Bibliography and Introductory Essay by W. RHYS ROBERTS, editor of Longinus, etc. \$2.50 net.

EURIPIDES.—Andromache. A. R. F. HYSLOP, Assistant Master in Harrow School, editor. 60 cents net.

— Cyclops. With Prefatory Essay, Rhythymical Scheme of Lyric Parts, Notes, etc., by JOHN PATTERSON, Louisville, Ky. \$1.25 net.

GREEK MELIC POETS. By HERBERT WEIR SMYTH, Bryn Mawr College. *Classical Series.* \$2.60 net.

NEPOS, CORNELIUS.—Twenty Lives. Edited by JOHN E. BARSS, Hotchkiss School. Illustrated. *Macmillan's Latin Series.* 90 cents net.

— Miltiades and Epaminondas. Edited with vocabulary, etc., by G. H. NALL. *Macmillan's Elementary Classics.* 40 cents net.

SALLUST—Catiline. Edited by W. C. SUMMERS, Owens College, Manchester. *Pitt Press Series.* 60 cents net.

— Catiline. Edited with vocabulary, etc. by G. H. NALL. *Macmillan's Elementary Classics.* 40 cents net.

SOPHOCLES. New editions of the *Oedipus Coloneus* and *Antigone* as edited and translated by Prof. R. C. JEBB. Each, \$3.25 net.

TRANSLATIONS.

CICERO.—The Letters of,—in Chronological Order. Translated by EVELYN S. SHUCKBURGH, author of "The History of Rome," etc. Four volumes. \$6.00 net. Each volume separately \$1.50 net.

HOMER. The Iliad and The Odyssey.—Done into English Prose by ANDREW LANG and others. Cheaper Edition, each 80 cents net.

OLD TESTAMENT IN GREEK.—An Introduction to the. By HENRY BARCLAY SWETE. \$2.50 net.

HISTORICAL, CRITICAL, Etc.

BURY.—A History of Greece to the Death of Alexander the Great. By I. B. BURY, author of "The Roman Empire." \$1.90 net.

SWOBODA.—Greek History. Translated from the German of Prof. HEINRICH SWOBODA, by LIONEL D. BARNETT. With frontispiece. *Temple Cyclopædic Primers.* 40 cents, net.

KOCH.—Roman History. By Dr. JULIUS KOCH. Translated from the German by LIONEL D. BARNETT. With frontispiece. *Temple Cyclopædic Primers.* 40 cents, net.

WICKHOFF.—Roman Art. Some of its Principles and Their Application to Early Christian Painting. By FRANZ WICKHOFF. Translated and edited by MRS. S. ARTHUR STRONG, LL.D. With 14 plates and numerous text illustrations. Imperial 8vo. Cloth. \$8.00.

The Macmillan Company, 66 Fifth Ave., New York

THE Cornell Studies in Classical Philology

EDITED BY

CHARLES EDWIN BENNETT

AND

GEORGE PRENTICE BRISTOL.

-
- I. The CUM Constructions: their history and functions, by William Gardner Hale. Part i: Critical, 1887. Part ii: Constructive, 1889.
Out of Print
- II. Analogy and the Scope of its Application in Language, by Benjamin Ide Wheeler, 1887.
Out of Print
- III. The Cult of Asklepios, by Alice Walton, 1894.
Price 80 cts.
- IV. The Development of the Athenian Constitution, by George Willis Botsford, 1893.
Price \$1.50
- V. Index Antiphonteus: composuit Frank Lovis van Cleef, 1895.
Price \$1.00
- VI. Studies in Latin Moods and Tenses, by Herbert Charles Elmer, 1898.
Price \$1.50
- VII. The Athenian Secretaries, by William Scott Ferguson, 1898.
Price 50 cts.
- VIII. The Five Post-Kleisthenean Tribes, by Fred Orlando Bates, 1898.
Price 50 cts.
- IX. Critique of Some Recent Subjunctive Theories, by Charles Edwin Bennett, 1898.
Price 50 cts.
- X. The Athenian Archons of the Third and Second Centuries Before Christ, by William Scott Ferguson, 1899.
Price 75 cts.
- XI. Index in Xenophoutis Memorabilia, Confecerunt Catherina Maria Gloth, Maria Francisca Kellogg, 1900.
Price \$1.00.
- XII. A Study of the Greek Paean, with Appendixes containing the Hymns found at Delphi and the other extant Fragments of Paearans, by Arthur Fairbanks. 1900.
Price \$1.00.
- XIII. The Subjunctive Substantive Clauses in Plautus, not including Indirect Questions, by Charles L. Durham. 1901.
Price 80 cts.
- XIV. The Use of the Genitive and Accusative with Verbs of *Remembering* and *Forgetting*, by Clinton L. Babcock. 1901.
Price 60 cts.

PUBLISHED FOR THE UNIVERSITY BY
The Macmillan Company, 66 Fifth Ave., New York.

PA
25
C7
v.13

Cornell University

Cornell studies in
classical philology

CIRCULATE AS MONOGRAPH

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

CIRCULATE AS MONOGRAPH

